I.—STAHL'S SYNTAX OF THE GREEK VERB.

First Article.

Prolegomena.

No one can appreciate the value of Stahl's Syntax of the Greek Verb so well as one who has worked on the same lines for as many years as Stahl has done and on the same general principle of direct study of the monuments of the language.[1] All honor to the untiring industry that has accumulated a mass of material which puts to shame many a specialist. All honor to the intellectual courage that undertakes to erect a new system on the basis of personal research. Special acknowledgments to his predecessors there are none and with a touch of national arrogance Stahl claims to have bettered his instructions everywhere. To verify this statement, to compare his treatment with that of the long list of syntacticians from Apollonios down to the latest file-closer of the psychological school, would be a task not unworthy of one who has the leisure for such a survey; and in a recent number of the Journal I made some such promise: but my time is short, and the best I can do under the circumstances is to summarize the book so far as that is possible in the compass of two or three articles. If, in the course of this summary, I refer to my own writings, it is not because I claim for my performances any startling originality but because these references will show that my previous studies have given me some right to an opinion on the points discussed.

[1] Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit von J. M. Stahl. Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1907.

18

In the preface we are told that this is the first thorough historical treatment of the subject, the first comprehensive study of the growth, or, 'wenn das hübscher lautet', the *Werdeprozess* of the syntax of the Greek verb. True, to use his own figure, the sphygmograph that registers the beating of the pulse of language does not everywhere present so consecutive and so satisfactory a record as in the moods, but wherever any movement can be felt, the sphygmograph must be applied. <Unfortunately the sphygmograph is itself a throbbing finger, and the observer is apt to confound the beat of his own heart with the pulse of that very tricky personification, language.>

Now here at the threshold one pauses to remark that the history of a growth like language is not to be followed like the growth of a chick. We are in a world of conventions from the very beginning (A. J. P. XXIII 128). Our earliest monument of the Greek language brings us face to face with just such a world, face to face with a language that is not speech (A. J. P. XXIV 353). Nothing can be more futile than the assumption that the first emergence of a construction in literature is conclusive evidence of its date in speech (A. J. P. III 197; IV 434, 443). And yet this assumption vitiates much of the work that has been done in the historical line. Our early literature is all poetical, all the product of the school. The pulses are carefully regulated by the beat of the metre. You have ἰδέσθαι and you yearn for the participle. Yearn as much as you choose, ἰδόμενος is withheld. 'Quod versu dicere non est' holds for Homer as for Horace. 'On saute dans un cerceau', to borrow a phrase from Barbey d'Aurevilly. Our first great prose writer is as artificial, or if you choose, as artistic, as our first great poet. Inscriptions are precious, but most of our inscriptions are under the ban of legal formulae, and when the Greek took the graver in hand, the native flow of his blood was checked. We cannot trust the sphygmograph. We may speculate but we must not dogmatize, and yet what would a grammarian be, if he were not dogmatic?

Next we are told that this supreme achievement of Stahl's differs from its predecessors by its critical point of view. Other scholars have grazed these questions, have actually studied the texts they were citing with some regard to their soundness, but Stahl has excelled them all in the thoroughness of his study, the fulness of his discussion and the magisterial maintenance of his opinions. Opponents he never mentions, for he abhors po-

lemics. On questions of textual criticism he turns his thumb at times and mentions the name as he turns it; but his condemnation as well as his acceptance of current views is impersonal, and the man he means must be content to bite his thumb in response. He is in debt to his predecessors. Who is not? He has appropriated Delbrück's view as to the original signification of subjunctive and optative, and Windisch's view of the relative as an anaphoric demonstrative. But these are disputed views and Stahl claims to have improved on the arguments of the originators and thus made their theories his own. The ordinary text-books have failed to satisfy him. What specialist have they ever satisfied? The various monographs have likewise come short so far as he has condescended to read them. To him they were largely unnecessary, for he has gone back to the sources. A shining example, doubtless, but for the honor of our craft let us cherish the belief that it is not a solitary one.[1]

Of course, working through all the authors, all the fragments, all the inscriptions over the whole range of syntax, over the whole extent of Greek literature was impossible even for the superhuman powers of a Stahl and so he has wisely limited himself to the verb and to the period that stops at Aristotle. Having done this independently, he felt himself able to renounce the study of all the monographic literature, though he believes that he has not overlooked anything of importance. To the Schanz series, however, he is indebted for much help, and he is very grateful for it. Of cis-Atlantic work he makes no special note though cis-Atlantic work has not altogether escaped the attention of the authors of the Schanz series, or of men like Brugmann and Delbrück. Not averse to statistics is Stahl but, as he gives no authorities, one is left to infer that he has done the whole work again for himself. To judge by the industry that has brought together an unparalleled wealth of illustrative material, he is perfectly capable of having done it and I, for one, will not dispute his claim to independence here also.

---

[1] Um Krüger's Gründlichkeit und Ausdauer bei dem Studium der einzelnen Schriftsteller behufs Ausarbeitung seiner Grammatik zu charakterisieren will ich nur aus seinem Handexemplar des Aristophanes die auf dem Vorblatte befindliche Notiz anführen: Sommer 1840 am 8. August den Ar. zum zweiten M. in diesem Jahre durchgelesen, 13. Aug. zum dritten, 21. Aug. zum vierten, 27. zum fünften Mal—Poekel, K. W. Krügers Lebensabriss, 1885, p. 21. Das war ein Mann, den möchte man mit den Nägeln aus der Erde kratzen, as was said of Fabricius (A. J. P. X 383).

In his Methodology Stahl takes up the different methods of syntactical study, the Empirical, which collects and sorts the facts and in this way arrives at mechanical rules that have no reasoned basis. This is the oldest form and is valuable so far as it goes, but is not scientific. The second is the Logical Method, which gives the logical content of the syntactical forms of expression. And there it stops or ought to stop. We are not to impose logical categories on language. Language and thought are not coëxtensive. We have to reckon with feeling and fancy, the sentimentality of concord between adjective and substantive, the absurdities and inconsistencies of grammatical gender <things discarded by our logical and practical English>. As a specimen of illogicality on the part of Greek, Stahl cites the use of the past tense to express unreality. 'If anything is real', he says, ' it is the past'. <But what we call unreality is past opportunity, the Tantalus suspense that becomes eternal. The imperfect needs no ἄν to make it unreal. The psychologists claim the past as well as the future for potentiality[1] and the phenomenon is one of perpetual recurrence, so that Stahl might have selected a better example for a specific Greek manifestation.>

Then he goes on to say that strict logical definitions of the functions of the forms are impossible. We can only speak of an *a potiori* use. The so-called parts of speech are not to be taken too seriously. Noun and verb, adjective and substantive, active and passive, mood and tense often behave in a scandalous way <that can only be fitly described in Biblical language. Aholahs and Aholibahs are they all. They are as inconsequent as a French cocotte (A. J. P. XXIII 130), and their choppings and changings are not to be regulated by categories. And yet *a potiori* has its rights, and we must be thankful to Stahl for allowing us to use the old terms; for much that we call style—and my chief interest in syntax is frankly stylistic—depends in large measure on these deviations from the accustomed track, these leapings over the wall (A. J. P. XXIII 6)>.

Logic does not suffice, but the logic-chopper blazes the way for the historian. Language does not stand still and we cannot stand still to amplify with Stahl what was a trite observation in the days of Horace. Language is a living organism and the rest of it. It develops, it evolves, and it is our business to follow the

[1] J. van Ginneken, Principes de linguistique psychologique, p. 97.

stages of its historical development, its organic evolution, which Stahl like the rest supposes to be absolutely coincident with chronological manifestation in literature. It lies in the nature of language that in the course of time it should tend to greater clearness and definiteness <and it is a thousand pities that writers on syntax do not avail themselves more freely of the facilities afforded by this evolution>. So long as language lived only in oral use and served the purpose of oral communication, much was left unexpressed, much had to be supplied by tone and gesture. Language lacking tone and gesture was forced to be more exact. The intellectual life became richer, the interpretation of thought finer and more complicated, until at the last we reach such a consummation as we have in Stahl. <But tone and gesture are still needed to interpret language. Else the actor's occupation were gone. Attic has lost subtleties that are no subtleties to Homer. 'Yea' and 'Nay' are slumped with 'Yes' and 'No' in modern English—a matter that roused the ire of Sir Thomas More,—and foreigners are apt to slump *oui* and *si.*> The language of the early time, Stahl goes on to say in no unfamiliar strain, puts the simple thoughts of that day side by side, the richer life of thought requires a more complex arrangement. Parataxis is followed by hypotaxis (A. J. P. XXIV 390, 391). 'All this is readily traced', says Stahl. But where? In the literature, which shows a decrease of parataxis, an increase of hypotaxis. <But where? Where the laws of style demand it. All this goes beyond our historical record. To reproduce the early conditions we have to study the language of the people, the language of children, our own consciousness of the process of thought (Nutting, The Order of Conditional Thought, A. J. P. XXIV 25 foll.; 149 foll.; 278 foll.), and the answers are very unsatisfactory. One recalls what Quintilian says, I. O. 3, 96: Non ut quidque primum dicendum, ita primum cogitandum. As our everyday speech is full of the fossils of dead philosophies, so we have inherited turns of expression that defy analysis. We accept the traditional totalities as totalities. The Roman did not analyze *quin* (A. J. P. XXIII 138). We do not analyze *but.*>

'With the development of the departments of literature', says Stahl, 'differences arise'. There is one kind of syntax for poetry, another kind of syntax for prose. Tragedy and comedy differ, oratory and history (A. J. P. XXIII 6). For the understanding of all this the empirico-logical method is impotent. It puts a

definite period of the language as a basis and counts as exceptions everything that varies from that.   <And yet something is to be said in behalf of those who demand a ποῦ στῶ for any study of a language.   The modern psychological study of language begins with the spoken language of to-day and sentences are made up—sentences which are sometimes ungrammatical—in order to illustrate the psychological processes of grammar.   We have no such basis for the study of ancient Greek, and beginning with Homer has shown itself to be as unpractical as beginning with Chaucer would be for the acquisition of English.   The best thing we can do is to take a point of reference, the conventional language (S. C. G. iv) which must have been understood by the people, even if it was not spoken by the people.   Unless we have a standard there is no enjoyment in deviation.   When Lindsay tells us that the rules of our grammars will not answer for Plautus throughout, we rejoice with exceeding joy, but we should not abandon our rules for all that, for we find after all that Plautus hews closer to the Ciceronian line than we should have supposed *a priori*.   No one who has a right to an opinion about Greek syntax is a rigid uniformitarian, but we have each his own weakness, and as we shall see, Stahl is as relentless in some directions as he is liberal in others.>

The importance of the Comparative Method—really a part of the Historical Method—is recognized by Stahl, especially in the doctrine of the cases in which the comparison of kindred languages enables us to understand the syncretism of the dative with its triple element, of the genitive which carries the ablative in its bosom, so that we can separate and must separate the instrumental dative and the local dative from the personal dative and the ablative genitive from the genitive proper.   <Can we?   Must we?   The doctrine of the syncretism of the cases goes back to Quintilian (A. J. P. XXIII 20) and what goes back to Quintilian goes much farther back, and I venture to say that the problem of assignment is one of the most puzzling that the student has to encounter, especially when that student has to face the ultimate question, which is not what analysis reveals to us but what synthesis has to say to those who used the language.   It is the quest of the originals of the composite photograph, and, so far from being a mere matter of theory, the problem stares one in the face whenever we apply the practical test of translation (A. J. P. XXIII 21).   Mr. Mackail has won great renown by his translations.   I have

given up the practice of that difficult art, to which I was once addicted (cf. Pindar I. E. xxvii; A. J. P. XIII 517; XXI 108; XXII 104 al.); and I am happy to learn from those who are more gifted, for it is a gift. On the very first pages of his Anthology he renders (The Garland of Meleager, v. 10) Νοσσίδος ἦς δέλτοις κηρὸν ἔτηξεν "Ερως 'Nossis, on whose tablets Love melted the wax'. The syntactician mindful of his Meisterhans,³ p. 209, might have a word to say in favour of 'for whose tablets Love melted wax'. In poetry the local dative is never to be preferred if the personal dative will serve (A. J. P. XXIII 21). But to return to our Stahl.>

Among the conquests of the comparative method Stahl counts the formation and original signification of the passive, the meaning of the tense stems and the augment, the separation of the injunctive from the imperative, the formation and original signification of the infinitive. But *modus totus noster est.* Here we can snap our fingers at other languages. In the Vedas there are only flotsam and jetsam subjunctives. In Latin subjunctive and optative are fused (A. J. P. XXV 481), and in Germanic the optative has thrust the subjunctive to the wall. In Greek we can afford to be independent.

Empiric and historic study, controlled by critical method, can give us external rules. Logic presses on to the fundamental forms of thought, to the inner laws. But language cannot be exhausted by logical processes. Its inmost secret can only be disclosed by psychological study. In fact the logical method leads to psychology. <The trouble is that in psychology we cannot shake off logic. The sting is in the tail of the word.>¹ 'The subjunctive', says Stahl, 'as the mood of the will, the subjunctive as the mood of a statement that is good for all time, the subjunctive as a prospective mood, all these subjunctives cannot be brought under the same category'. The indicatives of the real and the unreal exclude each other. The derived significations are not logical subdivisions, they are psychological ramifications. The optative, the mood of the will, passes over into a mood of assertion. 'It is a problem', says Stahl <but the problem is simplified for those who are born to the English language, who use our 'shall' and 'will', our 'would' and 'should' with the same shift, and think nothing of it. The wish which is father to the thought

¹ A Syntactician among the Psychologists. The Journal of Philosophy Vol. II, No. 4 (1905).

can hardly be told from its offspring and 'fancy' is now an opta-
tive, now an optative + ἄν>.   As a specimen of the reverse pro-
cess Stahl cites the future indicative used in the principal clause
as a mood of assertion, in the subordinate clause as a mood of will.
<But there are those who consider the future as originally modal,
and maintain that the original signification survives as elsewhere
in the dependent clause (S. C. G. 267).   Translation is no test but
the prevalence of the will future with the first person is worth
noting.>   Then, says Stahl, ' the mood becomes temporal when
the subjunctive stands for a future' <a mere future, he should
have said, for the subjunctive is necessarily future>.   In the
leading sentence the future is used as an imperative with the in-
dicative negative, in the final relative clause with the imperative
negative.   The optative, which starts life as a wish of the speaker,
becomes a notion of the speaker, then a notion of somebody else
and so finally a gnomon of obliquity.   <But there is a *salto
mortale* between the potential and the *oratio obliqua* optative
(A. J. P. XXVIII 206) in Greek, if not in German (A. J. P.
XXVI 68) as there is a *salto mortale* between the negative of the
optative with ἄν and the negative of the pure optative.>

Next we have to do with specializations.   ' Die besonderen
Arten des medialen Gebrauchs sind Spezialisierungen der allge-
meinen Bedeutung des Mediums', says Stahl, blissfully uncon-
scious that he is saying nothing more than 'Specialization is
Specialization'.   The process, he maintains, is from the general
to the particular.   <But the reverse view is tenable and not only
tenable but fashionable.   As Usener works up from the specialist
gods, the transparent gods, to the opaque gods (A. J. P. XVII
361) so Morris and his school—a parallel suggested by Morris
himself—are working up from specific manifestation to general
principle.   The specialist gods might be represented by the
πτώσεις ἴδιαι and the opaque gods by the πτώσεις κοιναί.   It is curious
to watch the progress of doctrine and find that the progress is
really refluence.   Take the cases.   First comes chaos.   Then the
period of grand generalizations, of parisyllabic and imparisyllabic.
Parisyllabic and imparisyllabic prove practically useless and the
declensions multiply.   There are ten in the Westminster Gram-
mar of 1630.   Then comes the era of the three declensions, doubt-
less hailed as a glorious advance, to be followed in our time by
the further simplification into vowel and consonant declensions.
But subdivisions become necessary so that the only scientific

method of handling the forms is to have as many declensions as there are stem-characteristics. And so in syntax the only scientific method of handling the accusative is to give all the nouns that are used in the accusative as Hübschmann has done for Zend (A. J. P. II 89). If this is not chaos from the teacher's point of view, it is a close approximation. And the same thing is true of the moods. There are as many subjunctives as there are frames of mind, and as many frames of mind as there are minds to frame.[1]>

But Stahl belongs to the period, not yet closed, of basic meanings and he goes on to illustrate his doctrine of specialization by the optative with ἄν. The optative with ἄν, it seems, starts life as a general affirmation. Then it becomes a potential by which the predicate is represented as something possible, and finally conditional by which something is conditioned. <But the optative + ἄν can never represent 'objective' possibility. Potential and possible are not identical (A. J. P. XX 231); there is such a thing as δυναίμην ἄν, such a thing as *possim*. There is a potentiality of possibility, and all optatives with ἄν are conditioned by personal conviction. The speaker sees an ἄν that others may not, cannot, will not see. The multiplication of categories gives a delightful exercise to the genetic grammarian, but it can hardly be called either a scientific advance or a practical advantage, and he who undertakes to translate Stahl into English will find that the distinguished grammarian has made classifications that can never mean anything except to a German.>

'Another thing to be considered', says Stahl, 'is the shifting of the sphere as when a verb of saying and thinking is used as a verb of will and *vice versa*'. Amen and amen. We all know that, and the grammars are all full of such things, but I will allow myself to remark that the categories are not always carefully delimited. So the verbs of reflection, such as ἐνθυμεῖσθαι and λογίζεσθαι, ought to have a place of their own and though practi-

---

[1] 'The frame of mind, the mental pulse, the state of digestion, the feeling that comes over one after a French *apéritif*, after an American cocktail, that feeling which suggests a stimulative subjunctive to match the stipulative subjunctive, the balancing between will and desire, the poor cat in the adage attitude,—all these subtle shades are subjective states that require a finer calculus than we have thus far at our disposal; and yet they all have their ample justification in the nature of things. Why should not the Greek and the Roman have as many moods as the Turk, and if these ancient languages fail to note by distinct forms all the various phases of emotion, why may we not supply them?' Oscillations and Nutations of Philological Studies, p. 10.

cally it is well to speak of a shift, the process is not simply a shift. Will is at the bottom of everything.[1] Call it προαίρεσις in the conscious stage, call it appetence in the unconscious stage. Absorption and appropriation, peristaltic movement and expulsion—that is the life of language as of everything else that lives.>

Then comes the question of the economics of language. Language has not a custom-made dress for every thought. <Sometimes she wears ἀναξυρίδες, sometimes θύλακοι.> ὡς is 'how', but it may serve as 'that' at a pinch (A. J. P. XIV 375). εἰ εἶχε is a logical or unreal condition. The context must decide. The utterance is colored by its surroundings. 'That is a wise economy', says Stahl. <The Greek was a thrifty soul and could not be expected to waste his oil and toil on framing this category and that, categories that are clearly recognized in languages commonly considered inferior to the Greek, and Stahl might have pointed out the shameful laziness that kept the Greek from giving gender to the persons of the verb as does the Hebrew. Stahl is no less anthropomorphic than the rest of us when we come to speak of language with a big L (A. J. P. XVIII 368). Language like the rest of us saves at one end and squanders at the other. In fact, Wunderlich makes 'Sparsamkeit' and 'Verschwendung' the basic principles of 'Umgangssprache', and it is a matter of notoriety that the Greek is perfectly lavish in his expenditure of the fairy money of the future (A. J. P. XXIII 128).>

And here Stahl insists, as we all insist, on the difference of the point of view, which is not to be confounded with the difference in the thing itself, and this is a matter to which he returns with wearisome iteration. The Galata tower is the same whether you look at it from the Pera side or the bridge side. The stick is the same whether you look at it endwise or otherwise. Future is future and past is past. 'There is even a great waste of acuteness', thinks Stahl, 'in manufacturing vital distinctions'. <Freedom shares the throne of law. Δίκη ξύνεδρος Ζηνὸς ἀρχαίοις νόμοις, sums up the whole thing—Justice, Divine Freedom, Ancient Use and Wont.> We know all that. But ' all that ' only means that the grammarian is fully prepared to ignore differences made by other grammarians and to emphasize those which he has established for himself. Stahl refuses to distinguish between ὅπως and

---

[1] A Syntactician among the Psychologists, l. c.

ὅπως ἄν, a distinction on which one Gildersleeve insists (A. J. P. IV 422; XXIII 12) cf. XXIV 394; and Gildersleeve declines to accept Stahl's categories of opt. + ἄν, as has just been set forth. The use of the aorist with definite numbers, which I consider a natural function of the aorist (S. C. G. 243), Stahl considers a freedom or rather an economy. 'It is not necessary', he says, 'to put the durative element in the form of the verb when it is indicated in the numeral'. That is one phase of his dislike to the use of the word 'complexive', in connexion with the aorist, whereas I am as fond of 'complexive' as if I had originated it. A participle may be at the same time temporal, conditional and causal,—that is to a German who always has trouble with the participle as I have shown elsewhere (A. J. P. IX 136), Stahl himself being one of my exemplars (A. J. P. XIX 463; XX 352). It is curious how we allow necessities of translation to interfere with the direct vision of a foreign language, how we multiply categories based chiefly on the auxiliary verbs employed in turning Greek and Latin into English (A. J. P. XIX 231, 351).

One bit of arbitrariness is evidently too much for Stahl. It is too much for most of us, and that is the restriction of the oblique optative to the sequence of the preterites, apart, of course, from instances of assimilation so-called. 'This restriction cannot lie', he says, 'in the nature of the *modus obliquus*, as we see by Latin, so that the only reason must be a psychological one'. Psychology is a fine covert from a storm of questions. In my judgment there is no woe upon us to explain this phenomenon by comparative syntax. These oblique relations belong to the after-growths and the ethnic grammarian has the right to pursue the search for the explanation within the range of the special language. The post-Homeric vanishing of the futural subjunctive in the leading clause Stahl attributes to the competition of the future indicative, which rendered the futural subjunctive unnecessary. Now the futural subjunctive being largely aoristic gave a shade which the future indicative does not give, and I should say that the real competitor is the optative with ἄν which is largely used to make up for the indeterminateness of the future, when it ceased to be a mood as it has ceased to be in the leading clause. Unfortunately Stahl does not believe in the modal nature of the future as I do, and he would not say with me that the future indicative has not succeeded in ousting the more exact expressions of temporal relations such as ὅταν and ἐπειδάν with present and

aorist subjunctive (A. J. P. XXIII 247), where the futural sub-
junctive holds its own.   The subordinate sentence is the Ararat
in the flood of change here as elsewhere.

The personification we call language being feminine picks and
chooses.   Being a woman she has often no other than a woman's
reason and thinks it so because she thinks it so (A. J. P. XXIV
397; XXVIII 253), and Stahl sees a certain caprice in the resto-
ration of the subordinate imperative to such phrases as οἶσθ' ὁ
δρᾶσον.   It is feminine caprice, if one may judge by school girls'
English.   'Do you know what let's do' has been a pet illustra-
tion of mine for many a decennium.   Then again give Dame
Language an inch and she takes an ell like the rest of her sex.
The original accusative and infinitive was simple enough.   There
was the accusative, there was the infinitive, a legitimate accusa-
tive, a legitimate infinitive.   There is no more trouble about that
than about the accusative with the dative.   Then came the
accusativus cum infinitivo.   That is a different story, that is a
solus cum sola story and the combination is so close that all
manner of grammatical scandal is afloat and one is fain to cry out
with Cicero: quid tibi cum Caelio, quid cum homine adulescen-
tulo?   The absolute participles were not absolute originally.
What is absolute in one period is not absolute at another
(Pindar I. E. cxii).   The unreal imperfect had originally a
smaller territory (Goodwin, M. and T., R. E. 435).

Another category is that of assimilation or levelling, compar-
able with matching ribbons, if we dare to linger longer in the
feminine sphere.   The most notorious example is that presented
by the behaviour of the relative.   In the syntax of the verb
Stahl bids us distinguish between mere formal assimilation and
logical assimilation.   His examples of purely formal assimilation
are the use of the optative after optative + ἄν or the pure optative
and the participle after ὥστε under the influence of another parti-
ciple (A. J. P. VII 172).   Are they merely formal?   His example
of the logical assimilation is the use of the indicative in sentences
dependent on an unreal indicative in which, as I set forth long
ago, the first unreality is merely parenthetic to the second
(A. J. P. IV 434).   'All which shows', says Stahl, 'the impor-
tance of combining psychology with logic'.   <'All which shows',
how easy it is to dress up familiar facts in fancy costume.   Put
the phenomena in other language and you seem to get some-
thing brand new.   I have recently read that the queer French

genius to whom I referred in the beginning of this article (p. 258) had engraved on his seal the English words ' Too late '. Perhaps some English genius will engrave on his seal ' Trop tard '. One envies the virginal state of mind that can be impressed with such shifts from one language to another.>

I have spent some time on Stahl's ' Methodology ': I shall make or try to make shorter work of his ' Grundbegriffe '. After these chapters are finished there will remain only 800 pages to be considered, but ' Fear not, little flock ', most of these 800 can be despatched by simple references; for Stahl repeats a great deal, amplifies a great deal, and multiplies categories unnecessarily. It takes the courage of a syntactical specialist to make his way through this mass of material, I had well nigh said ' wade '. But ' wade ' would imply that syntax is a morass (A. J. P. XXIII 106; XXVIII 487) and I do not wish to be disrespectful. Only one absurd distich comes up to my mind from Goethe's Wahrheit und Dichtung.

> Ober Yssel. Viel Morast
> Macht das gute Land verhasst.

But after all there is ' gutes Land ' in Stahl.

Under the head of ' Grundbegriffe ' Stahl extends the definition of syntax. ' Syntax ist die Lehre von der Bedeutung der Wortformen und ihrer Verbindung im und zum Satze '. This definition may serve to save the face of the syntactician who usually employs syntax as a rag-bag for holding odds and ends of linguistic observations. But syntax as the theory ' of the formation and combination of sentences ' (S. C. G. 1) involves the determination of the constituents of the sentence and of the connecting links of the sentence. A definition is not an inventory of contents. ' Im Anfang war der Satz ', says a high authority and properly understood the theory of the sentence will serve, though Krüger rebelled against that definition. What is the verb? But here my English fails me and I must transfer to my seal Stahl's own language. The verb according to Stahl is 'der sprachliche Ausdruck für den Erscheinungsbegriff an sich' in contradistinction to the substantive. ' Das Substantivum ', he says, ' bezeichnet einen Begriff als Substanz, das Verbum als Erscheinung an sich ', whereas the adjective gives 'die konstante an der Substanz haftende Erscheinung <die wir> Eigenschaft nennen'. The ' Erscheinung ' can present itself as a

'Substanz' and then we have the infinitive, the verbal substantive. It may present itself as a quality and then it becomes a verbal substantive. Then we have the story of adjectives used as substantives and substantives used as adjectives. Nothing is gained by all this would-be metaphysic from my point of view and if I should undertake to discuss Stahl, I might be accused of misrepresenting his theory. What I am concerned with is the registry of sensations, the analysis of sensations. Sensation is a current and the ῥῆμα is a ῥεῦμα. We are in the realm of the Herakleitean flux. Stahl is welcome to his Parmenidean ὄν. Fix the verb, it becomes a noun. Melt the noun, it becomes a verb. The verbal noun is a noun that deliquesces. The verbal adjective is a verb that clings, that deposits a film on the substantive. I have actually called it a skin (A. J. P. XX 352; XXIII 259), and I am not sorry that I have done so. I could not live without metaphor, nor can any one else (A. J. P. XXIX 239).

So I am not going to follow Stahl's criticism of current definitions and the defence of his own. One trouble is the incommensurability of German and English. Distinctions that may work perfectly well in German will not work in English. So under 'Erscheinung' he distinguishes 'Tätigkeit' and 'Zustand', 'activity' or 'action' and 'condition'. That might pass, but under 'Tätigkeit' he makes a distinction between 'Handlung und Tat'. 'Handlung' involves consciousness. 'Der Jäger erzählt von den Taten, aber nicht von den Handlungen seines Hundes; in der Fabel aber handelt der Fuchs klug'. We do not make the distinction in English, and forty years ago I thought it expedient to make special provision for animals considered as agents, 'a cane non magno saepe tenetur aper'. The rule was sorely needed as appears from a Latin Reader made up from Livy by one of the leading contributors to Harper's Latin Dictionary, in which the world was informed that 'Romulus et Remus lupa nutriti sunt'. Surely the taste that could distinguish between 'he-wolf' and 'she-wolf' as articles of diet must have been as subtle as the London alderman's with his 'callipash' and 'callipee'.

'Tätigkeit' and 'Handlung' defy the English language, but we can manage 'Ereignis' as 'event' and 'Vorgang' as 'process'. Against 'Zeitwort' for 'verb' Stahl contends valiantly, charges a paper screen and demolishes it utterly, as Mommsen says somewhere of Cicero. By 'Zeitwort' one would naturally understand

an adverb of time and the victory was won long ago. Apollonios
Dyskolos finds no favor in Stahl's eyes. His definition is an
inventory from which the participle is omitted, and moreover it
applies only to Greek. Unsatisfactory to Stahl is 'Aussagewort.'
The verb is not the only thing that predicates. Every word says
something. Especially offensive to Stahl is the definition of the
verb as a 'Tätigkeitsäusserung'. All these are contemptuously
rejected in favor of 'Erscheinung', which I dare not translate
phenomenon because of Aratos' Phaenomena, and what is to
become of 'Erscheinung' in the dark? Shall we call it 'manifes-
tation'? But there is λανθάνω, a most excellent verb. Is all this
hopelessly frivolous? Not quite so frivolous as it seems. Defi-
nitions are much more easily dodged than metaphors. Is σκιά
abstract or concrete? My answer would be. It is oxytone like
αἱμασιά ἁλιά, and the rest of the 'concrete' ιά's which cast it.

Subject and predicate are necessary to every logical sentence.
The so-called copula, the verbum substantivum is really a predi-
cate. Every grammarian uses it and every grammarian abuses it.
Stahl differs only in his vehemence and his claims to greater
consistency. Touch not, taste not, handle not the unclean thing.
It is a false, a fallacious expression. False it may be, but falla-
cious it is not. 'ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ is an incomplete thing', says Stahl.
Attribute cannot be predicate. True, a logical sentence may be
involved in an expression. αἰβοῖ may suggest ἀπέπτυσα, ψύττα may
suggest φθείρου, but that does not constitute a sentence any more
than the expletive one indulges in when reading a tiresome
grammatical treatise can be considered a judicial sentence. But
the interjection is multisignificant. Everything depends on the
tone, the gesture. ἡ Ξανθία is interpreted by βάδιζε δεῦρο. The
vocative is not a sentence, and Stahl, though he names no names,
is fighting against those who wish to extend the area of the sen-
tence (A. J. P. XXIII 6). As to the omission of the forms of
εἶναι, Stahl says that the frequent occurrence of the omission in
the oldest language makes it not unlikely that it goes back to
primeval time before εἶναι had lost its force, not to say had become
a copula, and before there was any distinction between adjective
as predicate and adjective as attribute.[1] <Then why insist so

---

[1] According to some scholars (see J. van Ginteren, l. c., p. 110), the primi-
tive copula is a pronoun, nay, εἰμί itself has been claimed as a verbalised
pronoun. The Hebrew omission of the copula and the reinforcement of the

rigidly as Stahl has done on the difference between attribute and predicate? If we are to go back to primeval ....ies, the predicate might be considered as an accusative of the object effected as in Arabic, a significant fact which I gleaned from Ewald Lehrb⁶., § 279, 1855, many, many years ago.[1] In that case the concord of subject and adjective predicate would be a mere assimilation. After the familiar ellipsis of forms of εἶναι (A. J. P. XXIII 7) Stahl takes up the ellipsis of verbs of motion, of verbs of saying and doing, of verbs involved in the context. All this may be considered elementary, but supplying ellipses may be dangerous sport, as Stahl himself has shown, when he follows Kühner and Goodwin in paralleling οὐχ ὅπως (p. 780) and οὐχ ὅτι (A. J. P. XX 228; XXVII 234).

The great division of sentences is into 'Urteilssätze' and 'Begehrungssätze' and the 'Urteilssätze' are further divided into 'Aussagesätze' and 'Fragesätze'. 'Opinion' and 'Desire'. Why not the other way? It is the common way, the genetic way. And the question is not a sentence at all unless it borrows its answer. Word-questions and sentence-questions, simple and disjunctive questions, questions proper and questions rhetorical, principal sentence and dependent sentence, coördination and subordination, simple, expanded and compound sentences, require no comment. Subject sentences and object sentences are comprised under the name of the substantive sentence. They stand in the same relation to the leading verb as do the corresponding nominal forms, and include adverbial relative sentences, the adverb representing time, place, manner and cause.

To causality Stahl devotes especial attention, as well he may (A. J. P. XXVIII 353), and causal sentences are distinguished thus: 1. Hypothetical (des vorausgesetzten Grundes). 2. Causal proper (des vorhandenen Grundes). 3. Concessive (des nicht wirkenden Grundes). 4. Consecutive (des umgekehrten Grundes). 5. Final sentences (der erstrebten Folge oder Absicht). I keep the German because 'Grund' is susceptible of a varied translation into English and because Germans play tricks with technical Latin terms. So the first translation of 'Voraussetzung' is 'pre-

---

identical relation by the pronoun (compare the use of οὗτος) are familiar facts. No one who has ever read can forget the ring of I Kings 18, 39.
יְהֹוָה הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים

[1] See now J. van Ginteren, p. 112.

sumption' and lo! we have a subdivision of the hypothetical
sentence which we call conditional sentence into the ' presump-
tive' and 'conditional' sentence. Stahl is evidently proud of
this distinction and he takes half a page to provide for the ' pre-
sumptive' group in which the leading verb involves the notion of
will, the ἀναμένειν ἐάν group, the *exspectare si* group, in which
ἀναμένειν and *exspectare* denote suspended action (μέλλειν). These
sentences have been roughly classed by some as interrogative sen-
tences. Against this Goodwin protested years ago (M.and T., R. E.,
§§ 493, 680), and on the corresponding Latin phenomenon Gaffiot
has recently written a special treatise. The thing is plain enough
and there is no need of Stahl's division. It is merely a matter of
involved condition. At any rate ' presumptive' would not be a
happy term in English, and I wish Stahl's English translator joy
in rendering the German phrases 'in dem Fall' for the condi-
tional and 'für den Fall' for the ' presumptive'. In idiomatic
English we should use ' in case ' for both and the German dis-
tinction, though comprehensible, seems to me more or less manu-
factured as ' in case' and 'against the case', ' in the event' and
'against the event' would be in English. ' Proviso' will not
answer for ' presumptive', because ' proviso' carries with it an
element of purpose. Compare the so-called conditional ὥστε (μή),
ἐφ' ᾧτε (μή). At all events, it seems to me a mistake to make such
a category basic. Concessive sentences Stahl divides into those
in which the inefficient cause is represented as real, and in those
in which it is assumed as real. The distinction between con-
cessive and adversative, to represent the two classes καὶ εἰ and
εἰ καί, seems to me more practical. But no two grammarians will
agree on these points and I will pass over Stahl's discussion
of the difference between 'Nebensatz' and 'abhängiger Satz'.
' All dependent sentences', he says, 'are subordinate sentences, but
all subordinate sentences are not dependent, such as relative
clauses, the form of which does not depend on that of the leading
verb.'

Important for Stahl's system is the division of subordinate
sentences into Synthetic, those that have an inner nexus with the
leading clause and Parathetic, those, the forms of which are
not determined by the leading verb. To the former class belongs,
f. i., ὥστε μή with inf., to the latter ὥστ' οὐ with ind.

The primitive nature of parataxis is recognized by Stahl, as we
have seen, and the later development of hypotaxis, but Stahl is

19

not parataxis mad. That peculiar form of *furore* is becoming obsolete (A. J. P. XXIII 253). But I am not quite satisfied with his statement. 'There is', he says, 'a widespread use of parataxis in Homer, and, though it gradually receded, it was never quite given up and even lent itself occasionally to rhetorical effect'. 'Never quite given up' and 'rhetorical effect' are not scientific expressions. One craves exact figures.

Transitive verb in the language of Apollonios is ῥῆμα ἀλλοπαθές, intransitive ῥῆμα αὐτοπαθές. The ordinary definition of transitive and intransitive Stahl finds as unsatisfactory as I do and have always done (cf. LG³ 213 R.), but he bids us distinguish carefully between the accusative of the object after the transitive verb and the accusative of the content after the intransitive verb, so that he is evidently working a different theory of the accusative than that which makes the outer object only a different phase of the inner object. That is the theory to which I have been addicted for half a century (LG³, p. 208 Note). Whether I owe it to Bernhardy or not, I ·cannot tell at this distance of time. Some one, I forget who, gives the credit of it to Erdmann, who is relatively of yesterday (A. J. P. XIV 372). Stahl's leading example of the combination of the accusative as the nearer, and the dative as the more remote, object is κεφαλήν τινι ἀποτέμνειν. The example is not well chosen. With such a verb as ἀποτέμνειν, we should almost inevitably have the genitive (cf. A. J. P. XXIII 232).

Impersonal verbs (ἀπρόσωπα) ought to be called, according to Stahl, unipersonal verbs and he considers it a contradiction in terms to speak of these verbs as subjectless after the manner of most recent grammarians. He agrees with Apollonios in maintaining that σωφρονεῖν προσήκει has a subject just as much as σωφροσύνη προσήκει or to use Priscian's illustration 'bonum est legere' is only another form of 'bona est lectio', LG³ 422 Note 1, and compare Lodge, A. J. P. XVI 372. The whole controversy turns on the conscious or sub-conscious survival of the original dative sense of the infinitive which it is hard to maintain in view of Il. 2, 455: τοῖσι δ' ἄφαρ πόλεμος γλυκίων γένετ' ἠὲ νέεσθαι and 10, 174: ὄλεθρος ἠὲ βιῶναι in which the inf. could not have well been other to the Homeric singer than it was to Euripides, Eur. Med. 542 : μήτε χρυσὸς μήτ' ὑμνῆσαι. The articular infinitive is, of course, a flat surrender. We are now luckily out of the forecourt of the Syntax of the Greek Verb, where I always kick my heels impa-

tiently. There is so little to be gained by all this would-be profound discussion for the real appreciation of the things that interest me. In my day the German professor, no matter what the subject was, used to give in his preliminary lecture a specimen of his house-philosophy and present to the admiring novice his theory of the universe and said admiring novice used to wonder at the 'mossy heads', who failed to jot down these outgivings of a great thinker. Now I am an ancient of days myself, and ought to have known better than to spend so much time on these preliminaries. The real business will begin with The Tenses and Moods. But before attacking them, let me say a few words about Stahl's presentation of

THE VOICES.

Of course, what we call in English after the old French grammars the Voices, Stahl calls Genera—the Greek γένη—a term based on a fancied resemblance to the genders, a positively indecent nomenclature. Compare ὕπτιος, *supinus*, and in another sphere *pathicus*. Things that are nowadays the common property of all school grammars, it will not be necessary to mention; as, f. i., the fact that the passive is a matter of function rather than of form, that there is but one distinctively passive form and that of seemingly late origin—the -θησομαι future. To the lone example of a distinctly fut. pass. form in Homer μιγήσεσθαι Il. 10, 365 (S. C. G. 168) Stahl adds δαήσεαι, Od. 3, 187, 325.

The intransitive use of transitive verbs is illustrated by a long list of verbs of motion that belong to this category, arranged for the most part alphabetically, for which we may be thankful just as we are thankful for the glimmer of an alphabetic arrangement in the fragments of Theognis. In so many other chapters the only order is the Teutonic order of Kraut und Rüben. Indeed, the lack of a definite and uniform principle of arrangement is one of the marked defects of the book from my point of view; and if any one will be at the pains of ordering the examples according to the departments of literature, he will appreciate the difficulty of a stylistic syntax. It is only when Stahl happens to take an interest in a special quest that the historical or artistic side is considered in mustering the proof texts. The transitive use of the intransitive, the causative use of the active, have only short lists. The latter it might have been well to emphasize because some scholars have considered the use as belonging in a special manner to the middle

(Pindar I. E. ciii; S. C. G. 144). The evasion of responsibility in most of the verbs in which the active is used for the passive (S. C. G., 172) Stahl has not noticed or not thought worth noticing. On the use of the future middle form of active verbs he has not been able to throw any light (A. J. P. III 227). What earthly help is it to say that the reason is to be sought in the fact that in many verbs the distinction between active and middle has vanished and that ἔσομαι has set a bad example? 'βήσομαι', he thinks, 'is due to differentiation from βήσω'. The problem remains where it was.

The middle with its general reflexiveness is subdivided by Stahl into various classes. What is usually called the direct reflexive, roughly equivalent to active + acc. Stahl calls the objective middle, which would not answer for English in which the objective case covers both acc. and dative, and in which there is a merging of forms. Whoever translates Stahl should be alive to these differences of idiom. English uses the reflexive more sparingly than German. The German reflexive is much lighter than the English which has practically discarded the simple personal pronouns for the cumbrous self-compounds, so that we use instead intransitives and passives much more than the German does, the passives, in fact, riotously in the face of heredity (A. J. P. XXIII 18). The Greek is, of course, still lighter than the German and the differences of idiom lead to analyses that may be superfluous for this and that idiom, but are after all not without interest. So in the long alphabetical list of 'objective middles' few will be found that do not involve a natural action (S. C. G. 146; cf. A. J. P. XXVIII 235), and the few that do not may be otherwise conceived. To Stahl and his fellow-Germans ἀπόλλυσθαι may be 'sich zu Grunde richten', but the first and most natural German rendering seems to be 'zu Grunde gehen'. To the Romans it was *perire* not *se perdere*. To us it is 'perish' not 'ruin one's self'. And so the other list of verbs of feeling, from αἰσχύνεσθαι to τέρπεσθαι, which are for the most part passively conceived in English. 'I am ashamed', 'I shame' (Shakespeare), 'I take shame to myself,' present different facets.

The indirect reflexive Stahl calls 'das Medium der Beteiligung'. The Latin is *sibi, in suum usum*; in German as in English the rendering is often the possessive pronoun. There is a long demonstration of ἄρχειν and ἄρχεσθαι, ποιεῖν and ποιεῖσθαι. Thuk. 6, 58, 2 he reads πομπὰς ποιεῖσθαι for πομπὰς ποιεῖν and Plat.

Legg. 865 A he drops τῶν ἀρχόντων in consonance with the general
principle ; for he is a uniformitarian, when it suits him.

The causative middle is treated at much greater length than
the causative active for which Stahl had curtly referred us to the
context. ἐστεφανώσατο Pind. O. 7, 81 and στεφανωσάμενος O. 7, 15
are no more causative than O. 14, 24 ἐστεφάνωσε χαίταν.

There is no disputing the value of these lists, but the interpre-
tation of the differences between active and middle is in many
cases, if I may say so, not so much grammatical as lexical ; that
is to say, the grammatical definition does not determine the prac-
tical use, the conventional use. So γῆμαι of the man, γήμασθαι of
the woman. We might insist on a uniform translation of 'marry'
for the man, and 'get married' for the woman, but the antique
bride did not rope in her husband as the modern bride does hers
and the *in suum usum* formula does not help.

A further division is made for the local middle, the 'towards',
'from' and 'with' middle, illustrated by μεταπέμπεσθαι and ἐφέλκεσθαι,
ἀποπέμπεσθαι and ἀποσείεσθαι, ἄγεσθαι and φέρεσθαι. To be sure, the
middle in all these verbs is not compulsory and the use of the
active where the middle would be customary produces what I
have ventured to call an aristocratic disdain of effect (S. C. G. 148).
With the ἄγεσθαι and φέρεσθαι verbs Stahl classes σκοπεῖσθαι, λογί-
ζεσθαι, ἐνθυμεῖσθαι. 'This conception', he thinks, 'is borne out by the
Homeric ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῇσιν, φράζετο θυμῷ and the like '. He may
be right, but a great deal of mischief has been wrought by the
appeal to the fuller expression. The fuller expression does not
necessarily give the conception of the briefer expression, just as in
the theory of the cases it does not follow by any means that we
have a whence-conception with the genitive wherever we can
give a whence-turn by a preposition such as ἐξ or ἀπό.

The reciprocal middle comes to its rights in Stahl, but while he
takes ἐρίζεσθαι as a reciprocal (see my note on Pind. O. 1, 58 :
ἐρίζεται rendered necessary by the remark in Fennell's first ed.),
he excludes ἀγωνίζεσθαι, μάχεσθαι, μάρνασθαι, because 'mutuality' is
not involved, as if it did not take two to make a quarrel.

And now we come to what I would fain call the drip-pan
middle, the πανδέκτης middle, the middle that is put at the
bottom to catch the drippings of the other uses as the ab-
lative is put to catch the drippings of the other cases. It is
called the intensive middle, the dynamic middle. We have five
chevaux de frise pages on the subject and after all the catego-

rizing, individual authors baffle us. There is, f. i., παρέχειν and παρέχεσθαι. If you read certain authors you are ready to formulate. ὁ παρέχων shirks responsibility for disagreeable things, ὁ παρεχόμενος takes the credit for agreeable things, but alas! Plato who after all writes Jove-like Greek sends the distinction ἐς κόρακας. In short the dynamic middle might as well be called the ethical middle and spelling it out with the help of 'out of one's own means' and the like is in many cases a mere concession to the mania for explaining the reflexive notion, which is often so faint that one forgives Curtius for his untenable explanation of -μαι, -σαι, -ται. After one has done one's best, one must needs fall back on the way of the language. λαβεῖν may be rendered to 'grip', and λαβέσθαι 'to get one's grip', the -εύειν and -εύεσθαι may be differentiated, πολιτεύειν 'to be a citizen', πολιτεύεσθαι 'to play one's part as a citizen', but ἕπεσθαι like *sequi* does not yield to us a reflexive sense without forcing, and after all is said and done we have to admit, as Stahl has done, that the language is capricious in such matters. We translate ἰδεῖν 'see', ἰδέσθαι 'to see with one's own eyes', an overtranslation as ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρᾶν shows, but if there is such virtue in ἰδέσθαι, why not in ἰδόμενος? Ah! the verse. Like the rest of us Stahl has to go into bankruptcy. Translation will not suffice. 'The middle may be quite appropriate', he says, 'and yet when there is no essential difference between the middle and the active the <frivolous> author may go to work <or rather to play> and use the active'. And the whole thing winds up with a chapter on the difference between the -κα and the strong perfects, the use of the aorist active (e. g., ἔδρακον) side by side with the present middle (e. g., δέρκομαι) and the tendency of the sigmatic aorist to the causative signification, ἔστησα)(ἔστην. All this is very disappointing in a work that was to have illuminated the whole track of our studies. The book will be a God-send to those who like to write about Greek syntax without reading Greek, and every Greek scholar will welcome the material, but the specialist in syntax who is really seeking light and who has worked through the whole period covered by Stahl will not be edified by the false points he has made and the ruthless way in which he breaks off those that he has not developed himself.

Then follows the chapter on the medio-passives, the future middle used as a passive and the small group of verbs in which the aor.-middle is used passively. Even in Attic ἰσχόμην appears as a passive, ἰσχέθην being late. But I will spare myself and my

reader the trouble of going through these and other familiar categories which Stahl's wider definition of syntax has brough into the range of his study.

A word or two as to the passive. Theoretically the passive ought to be formed from transitive verbs only with an accusative object, and he might have added that the word 'transitive' itself suggests the limitation. A transitive verb is a verb that passes over to a passive rather than one that passes over to an object. But with a lordliness that reminds one of English, the passive can be used with a subject which with the active would appear as a genitive object rarely or a dative object not infrequently.

But Stahl's rule seems to me incautiously worded (p. 69): 'Tritt zu einem persönlichen Dativ dieser Art im Aktivum ein sachliches Objekt im Akkusativ hinzu so bleibt dieses bei der Verwandlung ins Passivum'. Strictly construed this would warrant us in saying, *δίδονται πλοῦτον οἱ Ἕλληνες. Even English rebels against such a liberty, or at least is uneasy under it (A. J. P. XXIII 18; cf. II 92). The few examples he can rake up outside of the famous ἀποτμηθέντες τὰς κεφαλάς group, which does not count (A. J. P. XXV 110) are to be subsumed under the accusative of the inner object and are nearly all Thukydidean and on the same lines as the famous or infamous ἐπιτετραμμένοι τὴν φυλακήν=ἐπιτροπήν (S. C. G. 175).

The use of the passive aorist as the passive of the middle as well as the passive of the active (e. g., ᾑρέθην), the use of the deponent middle and passive and the variations of prose and poetry in these respects—these are matters that seem to clog syntax proper, and the conclusion that Stahl reaches that there is no hard and fast rule about the use of the voices will not console the student who has religiously worked through the long lists that can only be mastered by a personal familiarity with the living and moving body of the language.

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

II.—ACCENTUAL CLAUSULAE IN GREEK PROSE OF THE FIRST AND SECOND CENTURIES OF OUR ERA.

(*I. The Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.*)

It is now nearly twenty years since Professor Wilhelm Meyer, using as his starting point the earlier observations of Bouvy, set forth certain rules followed by writers of late Greek and Byzantine prose for producing rhythmical cadences at the ends of phrases and sentences. The formulation of these rules and the general limitation of the phenomena involved have been accepted without much dissent or essential modification, and pass current in the guild of scholarship under the name of Meyer's law. To the immense importance and interest of Meyer's discovery, all who have had occasion to deal with the matter, from whatever point of view, have borne willing and grateful testimony. And indeed the range of its significance is remarkably wide: for it not only discloses to our sight, but almost puts into our hands, one of the principal tools of the rhetorical workshop, it contributes to the phonology of the language, and in the field of text-criticism it affords a criterion free from the chances of mechanical error and, in varying degrees, independent of scribal caprice. It may be assumed in general that readers of this Journal are familiar with Meyer's law, but for those whose studies have not extended to the later periods to which it belongs, let it suffice here to state briefly that the phenomena embraced in it consist of certain final cadences which are constructed not by syllabic quantity, but by the collocation of word accents (primary or secondary).

Concerning the history and origins of these clausulae Meyer does not speak in his original monograph, but in the Fragmenta Burana (1901)[1] he observes: "Die von mir nachgewiesene Form des Schlusses, wonach vor der letzten Hebung [i. e. Accent] zwei Senkungen stehen müssen, tritt kurz vor 400 auf. In derselben Zeit hatte sich die accentuirte Form des lat. Schlusses

[1] Now in Gesam. Abhandlungen, Vol. I (1905), p. 19.

fixiert. . . . . Die lat. accentuirte Form ist ganz natürlich aus der quantitierenden Form [i. e. of Latin] gewachsen. Sie ist ganz sicher nicht der griechischen nachgebildet. *Kann für die griechische durchaus keine quantitierende oder anders gestaltete accentuirte Vorstufe gefunden werden*, dann sind wir bei der grossen Ähnlichkeit des griech. und des lat. Schlusses gezwungen anzunehmen, dass ein griech. Redekünstler im 4ten Jahrhundert den lat. rhythmischen Schluss in der griech. Sprache nach-geahmt habe und dass dieser Versuch durchgedrungen sei". I have quoted this passage because in the words which I have italicised it formulates precisely that which I shall here endeavor to set forth, viz., an accentual 'Vorstufe' to the developed accentual clausulae of the early 5th century, which in turn will appear as a natural development from the earlier quantitative clausulae of Asiatic-hellenistic prose.

But before passing to the text upon which my conclusions are based, I would call attention to a brief inquiry into the accentual clausulae of Himerius, which Wilamowitz incorporated into an early series of his Lesefrüchte (Hermes 34 (1899), pp. 214–218). He finds in this rhetorician, in the middle of the 4th century, the observance of certain rules for the construction of phrase endings, not identical with Meyer's formulation, but still obviously of related character. He infers (and without doubt correctly) that what Himerius practises had been the usage of his teachers, and concludes therefore that the phenomenon may go back as far as the end of the 3d century : "Hier [i. e. at Athens] ist also gegen Ende des 3. Jahrhunderts der denkwürdige Schritt gethan, der eigentlich der antiken Tradition ein Ende macht : der Ersatz des quantitier-enden durch das accentuirende Princip in der Prosa". The obser-vations of Wilamowitz concerning Himerius, in spite of Meyer's repudiation of them (l. c., p. 19), are unquestionably sound in prin-ciple, but his concluding generalization with its implications (which my citation does not fully reveal) is, I believe, wrong in fact and misleading in tone. For I think that it can be shown that accentual clausulae were in use at a much earlier time, and that transition from quantitative to accentual terminations was a gradual process, during which both forms appear side by side in different writers of the same time, and even side by side within the work of the same writer. There was no time of abrupt or sudden change, nor can the change be referred, I suspect, to any one writer or place or school as its author or source.

Within the limits of the present article I must confine myself practically to a single text, the Epistle to the Corinthians attributed to Clement, commonly designated as third in the succession of bishops of the Roman Church after St. Peter. Concerning the date of the letter I have accepted without independent inquiry the last decade of the first century, the period upon which practically all more recent students of the question have reached agreement.[1]   It will, I suspect, require a somewhat detailed proof to make plausible to others my own conviction that accentual clausulae are in fact present in this letter; but if my conclusions win credence, I shall in a subsequent discussion trace the further history of accentual clausulae in the period before 400, and set forth the bearings of my results upon the phenomena embraced in Meyer's law, and upon the formulation of the law itself. From these introductory words the reader will gain, I fear, the impression that I have gone forth deliberately to seek the accentual ' Vorstufe ' which Meyer desiderated—and there is prevalent, perhaps not without reason, a human suspicion that the philologist will find what he seeks for. But in fact I came upon the Epistle of Clement quite from the opposite direction, that is working down through specimens of Asiatic-hellenistic rhetoric, and, so far as the clausulae are concerned, contemplating them in the first instance merely from the point of view of syllabic quantity.

The Clementine Epistle to the Corinthians, as being perhaps the earliest extra-canonical writing of the Church, has engaged the attention of theological students in an exceptional degree, especially in later years, during which the discovery of important new sources of the text have greatly stimulated its investigation and study. It was first discovered in the famous Alexandrine MS of the Greek bible (A), which was presented to Charles I in 1628, and from this source the editio princeps was published by Patrick Young in 1633. This remained the unique source of the text until 1875, when Bryennius re-edited the letter from a MS of Constantinople (C), which supplied many smaller lacunae and the missing leaf at the end of A. Only a few months later a Syriac version (S) was acquired by the library of the University of Cambridge and its readings were made available by the

[1] Cf. Gebhardt u. Harnack, Proleg., p. 59, Lightfoot, Vol. I, p. 346, Harnack, Chronologie, Vol. I, p. 255: " Unser Brief ist am Ende der Regierungszeit Domitian's zwischen c. 93–95 geschrieben, schwerlich erst 96 oder 97."

reports of Lightfoot in his 2d edition (1890). The absence of a
Latin version of the epistle had led Lightfoot and others to
suspect that the letter had remained relatively unknown to the
Western Church, but in 1894 Germain Morin, an eminent scholar
of the Benedictine order, published as the second fascicle of his
Anecdota Maredsolana a Latin version from a MS of Namur
(of about the 11th century). For the purposes of our investiga-
tion it would be very valuable to determine exactly the time at
which this translation was made, but for the present I must
content myself with reporting the opinion of Harnack, who
agrees with Morin in placing it not long after the Greek version
itself, that is rather before than after 150 A. D. Finally in the
present year, as the latest addition to the noble series of Texte
und Untersuchungen, it has been published in Coptic translation
(K) by Carl Schmidt. For ordinary purposes of study and for
exact information concerning the status of the text all has been
done that could reasonably be asked in the thorough-going
editions of Gebhardt and Harnack (2d ed., Lpz., 1876), Lightfoot
(2d ed., 1890), and Knopf (Lpz., 1899), who was the first editor to
make thorough use of the Syriac and Latin versions. But let
me add here in passing a sigh, born of much futile page turning,
that no one of those admirable books is equipped with a com-
plete index verborum.[1] The discovery of a Coptic version (or
versions) leaves something still for the definitive edition, which
must form a part of the Berlin series of early Christian writers,
and I venture to add, with reserve and caution, my belief that
considerations of the rhythmical structure of the work will enable
a subsequent editor in some places to arrive at more certain con-
clusions in the face of conflicting witnesses to the text.

The existence of accentual clausulae in Greek prose, like
accentual rhythms in Greek verse, was of course dependent upon
the gradual change of Greek accentuation from the principle of
pitch or musical variation to the principle of intensity or stress.
This transition had begun much earlier than the date of our
document, but concerning the progress of the change it has been
difficult hitherto to obtain any other data than those afforded by
vulgar orthography. On this point let me quote from Kretschmer
in Kuhn's Zeitschrift, Vol. 30 (1890), p. 599. After quoting

---

[1] In the final revision of this paper I was able to use the admirable Index
Patristicus of Dr. E. J. Goodspeed and his pupils, lexicographical work of a
self-sacrificing type which deserves the highest credit.

examples of false orthography from papyri and inscriptions he summarizes as follows: " In der Mehrzahl der Fälle sind betonte Kürzen als lang oder unbetonte Längen als kurz bezeichnet. . . . . Thatsache ist also, dass die vulgäre Aussprache bereits im 2. Jahrh. v. Chr. Länge und Kürze zusammenfallen liess ". He proceeds then to the conclusion, based upon the date of the evidence employed, that the transition from musical to expiratory accent, at least in vulgar and colloquial speech, must have taken place in the 2d and 1st centuries B. C. " Dieser Übergang kann nur als ein allmählicher gedacht werden, und so mögen damals noch eine Zeit lang Tonhöhe und Tonstärke neben einander fortbestanden haben."

The conditions which Kretschmer describes seem to me to fit the phenomena which the clausulae of our letter reveal with considerable accuracy. We shall find that the accent has lengthened practically all short syllables upon which it stands, but it has not yet produced a thorough-going shortening of adjacent long syllables. That is, long unaccented syllables, as well as accented syllables (whether short or long), may under certain conditions be used as the starting point of rhythmical groups, and in this fact of the presence of both rhythmical principles side by side the peculiarity and the perplexity of the rhythmical structure of our document lie.

Let me begin with a list of quantitative clausulae taken from the opening lines of the letter. I shall cite usually from the edition of Knopf, and unless otherwise indicated it will be understood that I cite only true clausulae, that is the ends of longer or shorter phrases and sentences.[1]

ἐκλεκτοῖς | τοῦ θεοῦ
ἀνοσίου | στάσεως
οὐκ ἐκή|ρυξεν
πάντα ἐποι|εῖτε
νο|εῖν ἐπε|τρέπετε

---

[1] So far as possible, in order to eliminate subjective interpretation, I shall confine myself to those places marked by Knopf either with a comma (,). colon (·) or period (.). But as every student of these problems knows there is much superfluous, i. e., ' unphraseological ', punctuation in all of our editions, while on the other hand, in some places, modern editors regularly omit punctuation where, from the point of view of colon or phrase structure, it should stand, as for example, between two co-ordinate phrases connected by καί. These circumstances frustrate the attempt to obtain with anything like completeness an objective statistic.

ἐπιτελ|εῖν παρηγ|γέλλετε
ἀλ|αζονευ|όμενοι
δι|δόντες ἢ | λαμβάνοντες
ἦτε τοῖς | σπλάγχνοις
ὀφθαλμῶν | ὑμῶν.

These clausulae will be at once familiar to every student of Cicero or Seneca, or of contemporary Hellenistic rhetorical prose—the cretic basis, followed by a cadence of varying type, the nature of which seems to be fundamentally trochaic, $- \smile - \mid - \smile$ or $\smile\smile\smile$, $- \smile - \mid - \smile \smile$, and $- \smile - \mid - \smile - \smile$. My list is taken from the first 25 lines of the letter (after the address), and it might be extended indefinitely and illustrated with similar examples from Greek prose of nearly the same period (περὶ κόσμου, περὶ ὕψους, Chariton, etc.). There is therefore nothing remarkable here, nor different from what has been observed presumably by every more recent reader of Clement. Only one peculiarity do the examples reveal, viz., the fact that, while the clausulae are correct quantitatively, yet with one exception (λαμβάνοντες) the accents fall coincident with the rhythmical ictus. This is true in general of the quantitative clausulae in our letter. Some further evidence of it I shall instance in another connection,[1] but it will be superfluous to illustrate it in further detail at this point. In this list I have set down all the quantitative clausulae, in the portion of text chosen, about which no question could arise. In the following list I shall place all of the remaining clausulae in the same portion of text.

καὶ περιστάσεις
παρ' ὑμῖν πραγμάτων
ἀπονοίας ἐξέκαυσαν
μεγάλως βλαφθῆναι
οὐκ ἐδοκίμασεν
εὐσέβειαν οὐκ ἐθαύμασεν
οὐκ ἐμακάρισεν
θεοῦ ἐπορεύεσθε
παρ' ὑμῖν πρεσβυτέροις
τοὺς ἄνδρας ἑαυτῶν
οἰκουργεῖν ἐδιδάσκετε
πάνυ σωφρονούσας
ὑποτάσσοντες
καὶ προσέχοντες.

In these clausulae there are present varying degrees of irregularity, when measured strictly by syllabic quantity, some of

---

[1] Cf. treatment of words like πεποίθησις, ἀλήθεια, etc., on p. 289.

which might be accounted for by resolutions (θε|οῦ ἐπορεύ|εσθε), by the admission of a dactylic basis (οὐκ ἐδο|κίμασεν), and perhaps by still other means. But nothing can save some of these forms as quantitative clausulae. Either they are not intended to afford a rhythmical cadence, or else they have cadence value only by virtue of the lengthening effect of the accent. And that I believe to be the case, as for instance in these examples, which no manipulation can render quantitative: καὶ περι|στάσεις, με|γάλως βλαφ|θῆναι, παρ' ὑμῖν | πρεσβυτέροις, πάνυ σωφρονούσας.[1] I should not therefore have recourse to resolution in the example given above, but I would read boldly θε|οῦ ἐπο|ρεύεσθε, and so also ἀπο|νοίας ἐξ|έκαυσαν. Throughout this list it will be seen that the quantities are more or less awry, but that for the most part the accents stand in the same positions as in the preceding lists. It may be said: why assume clausulae at all in these cases? But it will be conceded by all who are familiar with the subject of prose rhythm that its manifestation, in a work where it appears at all, may be expected to be fairly regular and consistent.

I shall endeavor presently to devise something like a demonstration of the accentual character of the clausulae, as shown in certain words and word-types of frequent occurrence, but first let me add another passage which will illustrate not only the clausulae, but also the noteworthy continuous rhythm which is frequently found throughout the work. For this purpose I select ch. 45, and to avoid repetition I shall indicate at once my interpretation of the clausulae, and I add also in parallel columns the corresponding words of the Latin translation. The juxtaposition will be serviceable as furnishing a clue to the rhythm with which the Greek cadences were read by the translator.[2] As a specimen of continuous rhythm I shall set down the whole of the first sentence, and after that the clausulae throughout the chapter, following the punctuation of Knopf.

Φιλ|όνεικοι | ἔστε, | ἀδελφοί, | καὶ ζηλω|ταὶ περὶ |
pru|dentes es | tote, | fratres, | et zelo|tipi' de |
τῶν ἀνη|κόντων εἰς | σωτηρίαν.
eis qui|pertinent | ad salutem.

---

[1] Concerning this form, see below, p. 299.

[2] Cf. Knopf, Prolegomena, p. 45: "Den Ohren, für die diese Übersetzung berechnet war, muss das Griechische als Gemeindesprache noch etwas geläufiges gewesen sein."

(clausulae)

τῶν ἀνη|κόντων εἰς | σωτηρίαν	pertinent | ad salutem
ἱε|ρὰς γραφὰς | τὰς ἀληθεῖς	sacras scrip|turas veras
πνεύματος | τοῦ ἁγίου	spiri|tu sancto | cognovistis
γέγραπται | ἐν αὐταῖς	neque fic|tum in eis
ἀπὸ ὁσ|ίων ἀνδρῶν	repro|batos a | sanctis viris
ἐδι|ώχθησαν | δίκαιοι	sustinu|erunt iusti
ἀλλ' ὑπὸ | ἀνόμων (or perhaps	sed ab in|iquis
ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀν|όμων)	
ἐφυλα | κίσθησαν	} om. L.
ἀλλ' ὑπὸ | ἀνοσίων	
c. S. <ἀλλ'> ὑπὸ | παρανόμων	lapi|dati sunt | ab scelestis
ζῆλον ἀν | ειληφότων	in|iquum[1] | receperunt
εὐκλεῶς | ἤνεγκαν	fortiter | tulerunt
εἴπωμεν | ἀδελφοί	dicimus | carissimi
	(ἀγαπητοί?)
λάκκον λε|όντων	lacu le|onum
θρησκείαν | τοῦ ὑψίστου	ex|celsi re|ligionem
εἰς κάμῑ|νον πυρός	in forna|ce ignis
μηδαμῶς | τοῦτο γέ|νοιτο	ne|quaquam hoc | fiat
ταῦτα δρά|σαντες	qui hoc ges|serunt
ἐξ|ήρισαν | θῡμοῦ	conten|derunt fu|roris
αἰκίαν | περιβαλεῖν	poenas im|mittere

(continuous)

μὴ εἰδότες   \| ὅτι ὁ \| ὕψιστος   \| ὑπ\|έρμαχος
ignorantes \| quia ex\|celsus pro\|pug\|nator est
καὶ ὑπερ\|ασπιστής \| ἐστιν τῶν \| ἐν καθαρᾷ \| συνειδήσει \|
. . . . om. L. . . . .   qui puro \| corde de-\|
λατρευόντων \| τῷ πανα\|ρέτῳ ὀν\|όματι   \| αὐτοῦ.
serviunt   \| mag\|nifico \| nomini \| illius.[2]

---

[1] *Iniquum* here, and *iniquis* above may be tetrasyllabic. In the clausulae of Ammianus -qu- usually has the value of a separate syllable.

[2] Concerning the Latin translation and its clausulae a word before passing on. The translator's aim was clearly to be as literal as possible, and it would be open for any one to say that (qui = quae) *pertinent ad salutem* was the inevitable literal rendering of (τῶν ἀνη)κόντων εἰς σωτηρίαν, and that the fact of clausular agreement was therefore meaningless. The same thing might be said of a number of the other terminations, where verbatim literalness yields the same clausula in Latin as is found in the Greek. But this explanation will not apply to a large number of other examples. The sentence of the Greek text ending in the clausula πνεύματος \| τοῦ ἁγίου has in the Latin been merged with the following in such a manner that the phrase does not end with *spiritu sancto*, but with *cognovistis*, corresponding to τοῦ ἁγίου. Again in the next sentence, the Greek has the clausula γέγραπται \| ἐν αὐταῖς, to which the Latin corresponds with the clausula *neque fictum in eis*, omitting *scriptum est*, which would complete the translation entirely. Observe also that the Latin

It will be seen, if my interpretation is correct, that the rhythmical structure in the clausulae consists of a loose trisyllabic basis, with an accent in either or both of the places corresponding to the longs of the cretic, while instances occur of correct quantitative cretic bases with violation of accent, like εἰς κάμῑ-, αἰκίαν, θρησκείαν. Similarly the cadence is constructed for the most part accentually, but in some instances quantitatively. So for example σωτηρίαν and τὰς ἀληθεῖς have both the rhythmical value of a ditrochaeus, the one accentual, the other quantitative. The continuous rhythm, as in the last three lines, is for the most part cretic, but it alternates with trochaic sequences like συνειδήσει, λατρευόντων.

I will now turn to some explanations. First of all it should be stated that the apparent arbitrariness in constructing clausulae according either to accent or quantity has some limitations, and was subject to some rules dependent upon the pronunciation of the language at this time. In the transitional stage of Greek accent which Kretschmer describes, it is reasonable to believe that the lengthening of accented short syllables took place at a much earlier time than the second or complementary stage of the shortening of adjacent unaccented long syllables. That is, πόνος for example became trochaic much earlier than θῡμοῦ became iambic. In this circumstance, that long unaccented syllables still had phonetic value as longs, and still asserted a retarding force upon pronunciation, lies the possibility of using the twofold rhythmical principle which the examples reveal. Some definite groups in which quantitative value still remained will be discussed and classified below. But some arbitrariness of treatment will still remain unexplained.

Let me first take up instances of the lengthening of short vowels under the stress of the accent, or if perhaps this statement

has transposed the arrangement of words in θρησκείαν | τοῦ ὑψίστου = *ex|celsi re|ligionem*, thus making the final cadences identical. But the translator was not able in all cases to reproduce the same rhythm as the Greek affords, and so contented himself with another admissible type. Thus in place of the double cretic εἰς κάμι|νον πυρός he was satisfied to use the cretic-trochaic termination *in fornac'* | *ignis*, and in the continuous rhythm at the end he substitutes for the trochaic rhythm of συνειδήσει | λατρευόντων the cretic movement of *corde de|serviunt*. The Latin clausulae afford no demonstration of the character of the Greek cadences, but they do afford a certain cumulative confirmation of a conclusion which may be reached by other means.

of the matter be inexact, let us say cases where a short syllable reinforced by the accent is allowed to stand in a place where quantitative usage would have required syllabic length. Simple examples of this type are very numerous:

3, 2		o	ζῆλος καὶ | φθόνος
3, 2	ε	ᾰ	ἔρις καὶ | στάσις
38, 7		ᾰ	κοσ|μήσας ἐ|χάρη
48, 1		ᾱ	τοῦτο ἐν | τάχει
35, 7		ε	λέγει γὰρ | ἡ γραφή
9, 3		ε	εὑρεθεὶς | μετετέθη
19, 3		ῐ	πᾶσαν τὴν | κτίσιν αὑτοῦ
11, 1		ῐ	αἰκισμὸν | τίθησιν
5, 4		o	ὑπ|ήνεγκεν | πόνους
37, 5		o	ὅλῳ τῷ | σώματι
37, 5		o	ὅλον τὸ | σῶυα
37, 3		ῠ	δύνανται | εἶναι

More striking, but not fundamentally different from these examples, are clausulae, the rhythm of which depends upon the accentuation of formative terminations like -ία, -μένους, -σύνη, -ότες, -έρους, etc.

But before turning to such examples of purely accentual treatment I would first note the treatment of certain words which yield naturally the syllabic material for correct quantitative clausulae. For example ἀλήθεια requires only a long syllable before it to yield the commonest form of quantitative clausula. It occurs, however, only once (35, 2), and the corresponding accusative form once also (31, 2), but in neither case in clausula. For this position we have invariably a form like καὶ ἀληθείᾳ (19, 1), or τῆς ἀληθείας (35, 5). That is to say (though the evidence of a single word is not sufficient) the writer chose for clausular position those forms in which the main accent was carried over into the final cadence, and avoided forms like ἀλήθεια ἀλήθειαν, which deprived the cadence of such an accent, though yielding equally well correct quantitative values. Again πεποίθησις and ταπείνωσις occur only in the genitive and dative forms (7 exx.) with a preceding accent, yielding thus always a form like καὶ ταπειν\|ώσει. καὶ ταπείνωσις, of the same metrical value in clausula, was apparently avoided.

The evidence by which the character of the non-quantitative clausulae may be determined, must be some more or less consistent grouping of accents in such a manner as to yield accentual equivalents to the quantitative forms. I have already pointed out (p. 285) that the quantitative clausulae in our letter usually

reveal coincident accent also, and in the examples just cited the apparent intention to bring about this coincidence by the choice of some forms and the avoidance of others has been seen. Let me therefore illustrate the method which I shall employ with the non-quantitative clausulae upon an example of correct quantitative structure. Ἀλαζονεία lends itself naturally by quantitative form to ditrochaic rhythm, with coincident accent. To obtain our trisyllabic basis we should expect it to be preceded in clausula by two syllables of which the first should bear the accent. This expectation we find confirmed in the two clear instances where it stands in clausula: ἐν | κόμπῳ ἀλ|αζονείας (16, 2) and πᾶσαν ἀλ| αζονείαν (13, 1). The same form occurs in the very short phrase in 14, 1 τοῖς ἐν ἀλ|αζονείᾳ. But in 21, 5 where it does not stand in clausula there is apparently no effort made to accommodate the preceding words to the ditrochaic cadence.

An *accentual* ditrochaic cadence is yielded by tetrasyllabic words ending in -ία. A list follows, which for the words selected is complete for clausular position.

7, 7	ἔλαβον | σωτηρίαν
45, 1	ἀνη|κόντων εἰς | σωτηρίαν
59, 2	ταύτης τῆς | ἁμαρτίας
47, 4	ἥττονα | ἁμαρτίαν | (ὑμῖν ἐπ|ήνεγκεν.)
50, 5	δι' ἀγ|άπης τὰς | ἁμαρτίας
53, 4	ἄφες τὴν | ἁμαρτίαν | (τῷ λαῷ | τούτῳ.)[1]
2, 2	ἐν | ἀγαθῇ | προθυμίᾳ
33, 1	ἐκτεν|είας καὶ | προθυμίας
35, 5	ἀδι|κίαν καὶ | ἀνομίαν (A)
	πονηρίαν (L)

From the divisions into clausulae which I have made it will be seen that I interpret all of these forms as consisting of a ditrochaic cadence accentual in character. The evidence for this interpretation is found in the consistent use of the trisyllabic, quasi-cretic, basis, a rule to which I have found but one exception where the examples occur in clausula. The exception is 31, 1 οἱ ὁδοὶ | τῆς | εὐλογίας.

From the negative side this conclusion receives some confirmation from the fact that the trisyllabic basis is neglected in positions where no definite rhythmical cadence was felt to be necessary. So for example in 7, 4 we find διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν not in clausula, and two citations from the LXX, although they termi-

---

[1] A very free adaptation and rearrangement of Exod. 32, 32.

nate sentences, similarly show no regard for the requisite basis (18, 14 and 39, 9). Still further compare the form σωτήριον, which might be used in quantitative clausula with the same value as σωτηρία, but not if the rhythm depends upon accent. In one instance (35, 12) it concludes the chapter in a quotation from the Psalms, thus: σω|τήριον | τοῦ θεοῦ, where reference to the LXX will show that τοῦ has been inserted by our author and obviously for rhythmical effect. Again at the beginning of the next chapter (36, 1) the word is used in clausula thus: σω|τήριον | ἡμῶν | ('Ιησοῦν Χριστόν). The significant thing is that with the shift of accent the position of the word is shifted. To take still another example, we have seen that ἁμαρτία in clausula is preceded by a trisyllabic basis, and is therefore to be interpreted as yielding ditrochaic rhythm. But in 49, 5 the word occurs in the gen. pl. πλῆθος ἁ|μαρτιῶν, and with the shift in accent the rhythm of the word is altered to another type (cretic), and a dissyllabic word (instead of a trisyllabic) now suffices for the construction of the proper basis.

In some cases words of this type may be employed in a slightly different rhythm, but still with observance of accent. Thus while in 47, 6 (Κο|ρινθίων | ἐκκλησίαν) we have ἐκκλησίαν as affording a ditrochaic cadence, yet in 44, 3 the first two syllables of it stand in the cretic basis thus: τῆς ἐκκλη | σίας πάσης. In this rhythm λειτουργία is found twice in clausula.

<div style="text-align:center">

44, 2   τὴν λειτουρ|γίαν αὐτοῦ

43, 3   ἀπο|βάλλεσθαι | τῆς λειτουρ|γίας,[1]

</div>

but in 44, 6 τεττ|μημένης | λειτουργίας (with quantitative basis). But these examples testify equally with the others to the value of -ῑ- as the starting point of a rhythm. In concluding this group of tetrasyllabic words let me add in juxtaposition some examples to show the rhythmical equivalence of -ῐ- and -ει-.

<div style="text-align:center">

41, 2   ἁμαρ|τίας καὶ | πλημμελείας

16, 2   οὐκ ἦλθεν ἐν | κόμπῳ ἁ|λαζονείας ⎫

                  οὐδ' ὑπερ|ηφανίας. ⎬

14, 1   τοῖς ἐν ἁ|λαζονείᾳ ⎫

             καὶ ἀκα|ταστασίᾳ. ⎬

</div>

A further list of miscellaneous examples of words in -ία follows:

<div style="text-align:center">

36, 2   ὀφθαλμοὶ | τῆς καρδίας

35, 5   κενοδο|ξίαν τε | καὶ ἀφιλ|οξενίαν

32, 3   τῆς δικαι|οπραγίας | (ἧς κατειρ|γάσαντο)

</div>

---

[1] Similarly in 59, 2 καὶ ἱκε|σίαν ποι|ούμενοι.

51, 2   δι|καίως ὁμ|οφωνίας

35, 1   ζω|ὴ ἐν ἀ|θανασία [1]

3, 2   καὶ | αἰχμαλω|σία.

With less violence to the rhythmical traditions of the language, but still quite irregularly, forms like ὁμονοίας–ᾳ, διανοίας–ᾳ are regularly found in clausula with ditrochaic value, preceded by the trisyllabic basis. They are significant as showing the rhythmical equivalence between -οίας–ᾳ, and -ίας–ᾳ.

There is no other group of words in which the complete parallelism of accentual and quantitative (or partially quantitative) forms can be shown so clearly. But if we may now accept the presence of certain types of clausulae as a reasonable presumption, it will be possible to demonstrate accentual rhythm for some characteristic words of more frequent occurrence. Let us take ἀγάπη.

33, 1   ἐγκατα|λίπωμεν | τὴν ἀγάπην

49, 5   οὐδὲν | βάναυσον | ἐν ἀγάπῃ

49, 5   ἀ|γάπη οὐ | στασιάζει

50, 1   θαυμασ|τόν ἐστιν | ἡ ἀγάπη

50, 3   οἱ ἐν ἀ|γάπῃ τελ|ειωθέντες

50, 5   ὁμο|νοίᾳ ἀ|γάπης

50, 5   δι’ ἀ|γάπης τὰς | ἁμαρτίας

53, 5   ὦ με|γάλης ἀ|γάπης

54, 1   τίς πεπλη|ροφορη|μένος ἀ|γάπης.

These are the only examples of the occurrence of the word in clausula, and it will be seen that in every instance some one of our recognized cadence forms is yielded, dependent for its rhythm at some point on the accent of the word. Finally a short passage of continuous rhythm from 49, 5 :

ἀ|γάπη κολ|λᾷ ἡμᾶς | τῷ θεῷ

ἀ|γάπη καλ|ύπτει || πλῆθος ἁ|μαρτιῶν.

A nice illustration of rhythmical change dependent upon the shift of accent is afforded by the three examples of ἀπόστολος which occur in clausula. We have in

42, 2   οἱ ἀ|πόστολοι | ἀπὸ τοῦ | Χριστοῦ

---

[1] I have omitted from this discussion one characteristic word which is found several times in clausula, viz., ἀγαθοποιΐα. It occurs some three or four times and is usually preceded by a trisyllabic group, e. g., 33, 1 ἀπὸ τῆς | ἀγαθοποιΐας. My first inclination was to read it with resolution thus : ἀγαθοποι|ΐας. But something is to be said for the lengthening of ο in compounds, and in that case we should have to accept the remainder of the word thus : ἀγαθο|ποι|ΐας, or better, ἀγα|θοποι|ΐας (see p. 300).

but in

5, 3	ἀγαθοὺς | ἀποστόλους
47, 1	Παύλου τοῦ | ἀποστόλου

cf. also

47, 4	ἀπο|στόλοις με|μαρτυρη|μένοις.

A similar word is πρεσβύτεροι. Thus we have in

44, 5	προοδ|οιπορή|σαντες πρεσ|βύτεροι

but in

1, 3	παρ' ὑμῖν | πρεσβυτέρους
3, 3	ἐπὶ τοὶς | πρεσβυτέρους
54, 2	τῶν καθε|σταμένων | πρεσβυτέρων
55, 4	παρὰ τῶν | πρεσβυτέρων
57, 1	ὑποτά|γητε τοῖς | πρεσβυτέροις
21, 6	πρεσβυ|τέρους τι|μήσωμεν.

Note also two examples of ἑτέρους, the only occurrence of the word, or any form of it, in clausula,

55, 2	ὅπως ἑ|τέρους λυ|τρώσονται
55, 2	ἑ|τέρους ἐ|ψώμισαν.

The usage with ἡμέρα is obscured by a defective text, but it seems to correspond to the preceding examples,

24, 3	ἀν|ίσταται | ἡ ἡμέρα (ἡ. C et fort. A)
25, 4	ἡ|μέρας βλε|πόντων πάντων
50, 3	ἕως | τῆσδε ἡ|μέρας παρ|ῆλθον (A.)
20, 2	ἡ|μέρα τε | καὶ νύξ (init., not cl.).

The usage with participial forms like -μένος, -μένοις, μένων is not consistent, but in most instances where they occur in positions which give a clue to their rhythmical value, the rhythm will be found to depend upon the accent. This is especially true in the cadence; quantitative usage is chiefly confined to the basis.

3, 1	ἐπετελ|έσθη τὸ | γεγραμμένον
17, 5	χρηματισ|μοῦ αὐτῷ | διδομένου
23, 1	ἐπὶ | τοὺς φοβου|μένους αὐτόν
59, 1	δι' ἡμῶν | εἰρημένοις
47, 4	ἀπο|στόλοις με|μαρτυρη|μένοις
47, 4	ἀνδρὶ δε|δοκιμασ|μένῳ παρ' | αὐτοῖς
51, 1	παρεμ|πτώσεις τοῦ | ἀντικει|μένου
43, 1	νενομο|θετημένοις (cf. νομοθέτης),

with which last example cf. ib. συνεπι\|μαρτυροῦντες, the initial word of the phrase: a corresponsion seems intended.

The examples are numerous and only a small selection can be given, but in conclusion let us note a word of this type of frequent occurrence, ἡγούμενοι:

(in nom.)

32, 2	καὶ ἡ|γούμενοι | κατὰ τὸν | Ἰούδαν
51, 5	οἱ ἡ|γούμενοι | αὐτοῦ (C)
55, 1	βασι|λεῖς καὶ ἡ|γούμενοι

(in obliq.)

1, 3	τοῖς ἡγου|μένοις ὑμῶν
5, 7	ἐπὶ τῶν | ἡγουμένων
37, 2	τοῖς ἡγου|μένοις ἡμῶν.

Examples of quantitative, or partially quantitative treatment (chiefly in basis):

54, 2	τῶν καθε|σταμένων | πρεσβυτέρων
44, 6	αὐ|τοῖς τετί|μημένης | λειτουργίας
35, 4	τῶν ἐπηγ|γελμένων | δωρεῶν.

In cadence

43, 1	κατ|έστησαν | τοὺς προει|ρημένους,

and the same phrase in 44, 2.

For the participle in -ότες, etc., the material is meagre, but

45, 4	ζῆλον ἀν|ειληφότων

and repeatedly in continuous rhythm, as in 20, 11: ὑπερεκ\|περισ-σῶς \| δ᾽ ἡμᾶς τοὺς \| προσπεφευ\|γότας τοῖς \| οἰκτιρμοῖς \| αὐτοῦ.

It is difficult to know how much exemplification of this sort is necessary to illustrate adequately the usage of our writer, but at the risk of needless prolixity I shall still add a few characteristic examples. We have observed above that ταπείνωσις (πεποίθησις) is always used with a preceding accent, yielding forms like καὶ ταπεινώσει—ώσεως, which are clausulae of pure quantitative type with coincident accent. Ταπεινοφροσύνη is a word of more frequent occurrence, and it also, in the 6 exx. of its occurrence, is always preceded by an accent, e. g.,

56, 1	καὶ ταπει|νοφροσύνη
44, 3	με|τὰ ταπει|νοφροσύνης.

This would seem to be adequate evidence that the cadence was meant to be ditrochaic in rhythm. This is confirmed by the usage of ἀφροσύνη, preceded by a trisyllabic basis in 13, 1 τύφος καὶ \| ἀφροσύνη (καὶ ὀργάς). Δικαιοσύνη is a harder word. The rhythm

δι|καιοσύνη would seem to be the most natural one, and it apparently occurs in

33, 8 ἔργον δι|καιοσύνης.

The remaining examples would seem to require δικαιο|σύνη, following the analogy of δίκαιος (cf. 45, 4 ἐδι|ώχθησαν | δίκαιοι).

13, 1 κρίμα καὶ | δικαιο|σύνη (citation but altered.)
35, 2 λαμ|πρότης ἐν | δικαιο|σύνη,

and this rhythm seems confirmed by the corresponsion in

48, 2 πύλη γὰρ | δικαιο|σύνης
εἰς ζωὴν | ἀνεω|γυῖα (ἐστιν αὕτη).

Ἅγιος occurs frequently, especially in the phrase πνεῦμα ἅγιον. The rhythm of the word as dependent upon its accent is nicely seen in these examples:

13, 1 πνεῦμα τὸ | ἅγιον (and so 16, 2 and 58, 2)
45, 2 διὰ τοῦ | πνεύματος | τοῦ ἁγίου (and 22, 1).

In clausula it is always found in either of these forms. But contrast 2, 2 πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου, and 63, 2 διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, which are not found in clausula and which do not conform to any of the rules that have been observed. Finally note an interesting example showing variation in rhythm with shift of accent:

59, 3 ὕψιστον | ἐν ὑψίστοις
ἅγιον | ἐν ἁγίοις (ἀναπαυ|όμενον.)

I have thus far devoted myself especially to demonstrating the presence of clausulae dependent upon accent for their structure. I have indicated also that there are many correct quantitative clausulae with coincident accent. But there remain still a number of clausulae which are quantitative (though not always strictly), but with violation of accent, or better without coincidence of accent. Participial forms like ἐπηγ|γελμένων | δωρεῶν I have touched upon above. Other examples are such as these:

(basis)	42, 3	τῷ λόγῳ	τοῦ θεοῦ
	34, 5	ἀγγέλων	αὐτοῦ
	42, 5	που λέγει	ἡ γραφή
	51, 4	εἰς Ἅιδου	ζῶντας
	45, 7	εἰς κάμῖ	νον πυρός
(cadence)	25, 5	ἀν|αγραφὰς	τῶν χρόνων
	21, 8	παρ|ὰ θεοῦ	ἰσχύει
	33, 3	ἑαυτοῦ	δυνάμει
	30, 3	δικαι|ούμενοι	μὴ λόγοις.

Concerning the explanation of such cases I am somewhat at a loss. May it be that the stress accent was still not strongly marked, and had the effect only of retarding the movement of the (cretic) rhythm, not of destroying it? Or it is a license admitted against the writer's habitual usage (but familiar to him from contemporary and earlier literature) for the sake of constructing the desired clausulae more easily? Both considerations probably have something to do with the truth of the matter.

There is, however, a group of words, usually found in quantitative positions, in which I do not doubt that there is present a peculiarity of the pronunciation of a transitional time. I refer to dissyllabic words with a final accent and with long penultimate syllable (or trisyllabic words of the same structure plus a light initial syllable) such as βωμός (or βοηθός). The phenomenon is so characteristic and illustrates so well a condition of instability between accent and quantity that I shall make a rather full enumeration of examples.[1]

5, 1	γενο|μένους ἀϑ|λητάς
9, 4	ζῶα εἰς | τὴν κιβωτόν
24, 5	ἐκφέρει | καρπόν
25, 4	ἡλίου | βωμόν
38, 2	ἐπιχορη|γείτω τῷ | πτωχῷ
39, 2	δύναται | θνητός
42, 5	τοῦτο οὐ | καινῶς
45, 2	ἱερ|ὰς γραφὰς | τὰς ἀληθεῖς
47, 6	Χριστῷ ἀ|γωγῆς
47, 6	καὶ λίαν | αἰσχρά
48, 5	ἤτω τις | πιστός
58, 1	ἀπει|θοῦσιν ἀ|πειλάς
59, 3	κινδυνευ|όντων βο|ηθόν

The same phenomenon appears in verb forms such as 25, 2 εἰσέρχεται | καὶ τελευτᾷ and 5, 7 δύσεως | ἐλθών. This does not exhaust the words of this class, but it will suffice for illustration. The characteristic feature of these examples is the long penult, which final accent has not yet shortened. In consequence the weight of this syllable takes away from the force of ultimate accent, and makes it possible and natural to use the words with

[1] Related to this class, but handled with much more freedom, are the pronouns ἡμεῖς, ὑμεῖς, αὐτός, which are used with the rhythmical ictus upon either syllable indifferently, and so also Ἰησοῦς and Χριστός. The dissyllabic prepositions ἀπό, ὑπό, ἐπί, etc. share this treatment, as is true also of the later periods embraced in Meyer's law. See exx. in Meyer, Vol. II, p. 210.

their original quantitative values.[1] It may be recalled in this connection that Nonnus, in the construction of his hexameters, deviates from his general rule, of coincidence of accent and quantity in the 5th and 6th foot, only with occasional words of this type: ἀνδρῶν, βουλήν, ὀπωπή, κεραυνῶν, and the pronouns ἡμεῖς, ὑμεῖς, αὐτός, are a few examples selected at random.

As rules to be mastered by any one who would read the composition correctly these details would be intolerable, but in practice it will be found that they are all yielded easily, and for the most part inevitably, when once the general proposition is apprehended, that our work represents a transitional stage from quantitative to accentual rhythm, a stage in which the developing stress accent had already lengthened most short syllables, had shortened some long syllables, but had not yet obliterated the quantitative value of others. It mirrors a living condition of a transitional time, a condition which made it even possible for the same syllable, according to the rhythmical context in which it stands, to be treated at one time with quantitative value, and at another time with neglect of quantity. This last statement will doubtless seem a hard doctrine to accept, but I think that its truth can be made reasonably apparent.

Take for example ἄκοντες, which by itself might in our author constitute either the basis or the cadence of a clausula. But in 2, 2 it stands in this rhythmical position: εἴ τι ἄ|κοντες ἡ|μάρτετε. The accent of the word here attaches itself to the preceding quasi-cretic foot, leaving the long syllable -κοντ- to become the starting point for the basis of the clausula. That is to say, the treatment becomes quantitative because the accent has been absorbed by the preceding context. This is what I mean by saying that the usage may be determined by the rhythmical context. Again λάβωμεν by itself may afford the customary trisyllabic basis, as in 24, 4 λάβωμεν | τοὺς καρπούς; but in ἀναλά|βωμεν, the two initial syllables, yielding a suitable secondary accent, usurp the main accent, and leave the long syllable -βω- free to become the starting point of another rhythmical group, as in 56, 2 ἀναλά| βωμεν παι|δείαν. If still another syllable is added (ἐγκατα|λίπωμεν) the accent may resume its place at the beginning of the foot as in

---

[1] Contrast with these, trisyllabic words with long penult plus *long* initial syllable. Here the reinforcement of initial secondary accent has been sufficient to allow them to stand in cretic position. E. g. 46, 9 πολλοὺς εἰς | διστ αγ-μόν; 11, 1 αἰκισμὸν | τίθησιν; 56, 1 οἰκτιρμῶν | μνεία.

33, I ἐγκατα|λίπωμεν | τὴν ἀγάπην.   But in cases such as λάβωμεν or λίπωμεν it is not my thought that the time value of pronunciation was the same as if the second syllable were short, like (ἐ)λάβομεν or (ἐ)λίπομεν.   The long ω of the subjunctive was still felt with an effect of retardation of utterance, and this retardation in turn was sufficient, when the accent could attach itself to a preceding context, to allow the retarding long syllable to become the starting point of another rhythmical group.   The phenomenon does not, therefore, seem to me arbitrary, but probably subject to the conditions of the pronunciation then prevailing.   Let the following examples serve to illustrate the usage : those on the left hand may be called roughly quantitative, those on the right accentual.

2, 2	εἴ τι ἄ	κοντες ἡ	μάρτετε	29, I	αἴροντες | πρὸς αὐτόν
51, 5	ἐρυθρὰν | καὶ ἀπώ|λοντο	55, 2	ἐ|τέρους λυ|τρώσονται
45, 7	ταῦτα δρά|σαντες	7, I	ὑπ.ομμ|νήσκοντες
49, I	δύναται | ἐξηγή|σασθαι	27, 2	ὁ παραγ|γείλας μὴ | ψεύδεσθαι

Theoretically one might sometimes be in doubt as to which form was intended, as in 55, I ἐθνῶν ἐνέγκωμεν, but in such cases I feel confident that the accentual cadence should be preferred—ἐθνῶν ἐν| ἐγκωμεν.   Finally both forms appear in the same context in 7, 6 ὑπακού|σαντες ἐ|σώθησαν, and more strikingly in 44, 4 ἐ|ποίησαν | καὶ ποιή|σουσιν.   The application of these principles to the reading of the text will be found for the most part easy and free from perplexity.   Let me take a passage of continuous rhythm from 20, 2 (a rhapsody on the order of the universe), the commata of which I shall make graphic by separate lines :

> ἡ|μέρα τε | καὶ νύξ
> τὸν τεταγ|μένον
> ὑπ' αὐτοῦ | δρόμον
> διανύ|ουσιν
> μηδὲν ἀλ|ληλοῖς
> ἐμποδί|ζοντα.

Or again at the end of the same chapter (20, 10):

> τά τ' ἐλά|χιστα τῶν | ζώων τὰς | συνελεύσεις
> αὐτῶν ἐν | ὁμονοίᾳ | καὶ εἰρή|νῃ ποιοῦνται.

There is a license of usage which disturbs the regularity of the clausulae, which in lieu of better term I venture to call an extrametrical anacrusis.   Its occurrence is relatively quite infrequent, and yet the number of cases is in fact considerable.   The nature

of the phenomenon may best be seen in some passages of continuous rhythm, which in the nature of things cannot be treated so strictly as the clausulae. Take, for example, 46, 7 ἵνα τί | δι| ἑλκομεν | καὶ δια|σπῶμεν τὰ | μέλη τοῦ | Χριστοῦ ; The writer's intention to construct a continuous series of (accentual) cretics is apparent, but he allows himself the freedom of using the initial syllable of διέλκομεν extra-metrically. The usage occasions no surprise in such passages as this, but the question arises as to how freely it is admitted into the more carefully constructed clausulae. The number of certain instances in which it occurs in such position is relatively so small that it would seem clearly to have been avoided. But of the admissibility of the license there can be no doubt. For example, in 45, 4 we have the clausula ζῆλον ἀν|ειληφότων; but in 3, 4 we have ἀσεβῆ | ἀν|ειληφότας. Again, in the consistent series of examples like ἔλαβον | σωτηρίαν, we find as noted above (p. 290) one exception in 31, 1 οἱ ὁδοὶ | τῆς | εὐλογίας. The syllable thus treated is usually of light accent, and does in fact only slightly interrupt the rhythmical movement of the cadence. Let these examples suffice for illustration :

37, 4	δίχα τῶν	με| γάλων
63, 2	τῇδε τῇ	ἐ| πιστολῇ
29, 1	εὐσπλαχνον	πα| τέρα ἡμῶν
43, 2	ὁ| νόματι	κε| κοσμημένη.

The short chapter 31 is very exceptional in that, of a total of eight clausulae, it presents five examples of this type. Practically its effect is to transform the quasi-cretic character of the basis into ditrochaic rhythm, and so to give to the whole clausula the effect of trochaic movement.

This movement, in fact, is found in a few other clausulae, in which we cannot reasonably speak of such an anacrusis.[1] I refer to examples such as these :

1, 3	πάνυ	σωφρο| νούσας
3, 4	δικαιο'σύνη	καὶ εἰ| ρήνη
5, 7	τόπον	ἐπο| ρεύθη.[2]

---

[1] I have used this term to describe only those cases in which an apparently superfluous syllable intervenes between a regular trisyllabic basis and the final cadence. In the examples above δίχα τῶν, τῇδε τῇ, etc., the preceding basis is clearly defined by natural syllabic grouping : in πάνυ σωφρονούσας, etc., it is not.

[2] These examples correspond to not uncommon accentual clausulae of later Latin, like *ille properabat*. The Latin form would seen to have been derived from the accentual treatment of such a resolved form as *esse videatur*.

The number of these clausulae is not great, but if we should put them together with the preceding examples, characterized by an anacrusis, and accept the whole group, not as a sharply defined clausula, but merely as evidence that our writer was satisfied at times with a somewhat indeterminate trochaic rhythm in clausula, we should have a formula which would cover practically all exceptions to our regular forms. To this class then I should assign ἀγα|θοποι|ία referred to above, and it would afford a consistent explanation for the otherwise puzzling δεσπότης. This word affords a perfect quantitative cretic, but the presumption, that our investigation up to this point has established, is that its accent should determine its rhythm thus : δεσ|πότης. This presumption is confirmed by clausulae such as these :

7, 5	ἔδωκεν | ὁ δεσπότης
9, 4	δι|έσωσεν | δι' αὐτοῦ | ὁ δεσπότης
36, 2	διὰ | τούτου ἠ|θέλησεν | ὁ δεσπότης
55, 6	τὸν παντεπ|όπτην δεσ|πότην
64, 1	θε|ὸς καὶ δεσ|πότης τῶν | πνευμάτων

and in confirmatory contrast, with shift of accent,

59, 4	ἀξι|οῦμέν σε | δέσποτα.

But on the other hand we have the phrase δεσπότης τῶν ἀπάντων, where our usual rule of trisyllabic basis would give us δεσπότης as a cretic. In this case, however, it proves to be misleading, as the analogy of another word shows. For we find δημιουργός in the same phrase in several instances, and there can be no doubt, I think, about the necessary rhythm of this word, thus

26, 1	δημι|ουργὸς | τῶν ἀπάντων.

Upon its analogy we may read, I feel confident,

8, 2	ὁ δεσ|πότης | τῶν ἀπάντων
33, 2	δημι|ουργὸς | καὶ δεσ|πότης | τῶν ἀπάντων
20, 11	ὁ μέγας | δημι|ουργὸς | καὶ δεσ|πότης | τῶν ἀπάντων.

Similar trochaic rhythm is afforded also by the remaining examples :

11, 1	ποι|ήσας | ὁ δεσ|πότης
36, 4	οὕτως | εἶπεν | ὁ δεσ|πότης.
56, 16	τοῖς παι|δευο|μένοις | ὑπὸ | τοῦ δεσ|πότου.
49, 6	ἡμᾶς | ὁ δεσ|πότης.

The fondness of our author for this rhythm in such resonant phrases as ὁ δεσπότης τῶν ἀπάντων may be due to the familiar formula of the doxology, τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Concerning hiatus it is to be said that our author shows much the same indifference as is found in the writings of the New Testament. Only the simplest cases are avoided by elision which our MSS have usually recorded.

With regard to resolutions there is not much to record. In the accentual clausulae of later Greek and Latin they play a very small rôle, and this condition is foreshadowed here. The examples that I have noted are chiefly of compcunds with ἐπί.

7, 1	νουθε|τοῦντες ἐπι|στέλλομεν
33, 1	ἀγαθὸν | ἐπιτελεῖν
40, 2	ἐπιμελῶς | ἐπιτελεῖσθαι (Lightfoot)
28, 1	μιαρὰς | ἐπιθυμίας
44, 2	ἐπινομὴν | ἔδωκαν
52, 1	ἐξ|ομολογεῖ|σθαι αὐτῷ (cf. 51, 3)
34, 7	ἐπ|αγγελιῶν | αὐτοῦ
25, 2	ἀποθανεῖν | αὐτό
45, 7	αἰκίαν | περιβαλεῖν.

It would be untimely to claim at once any value for these observations in questions of text criticism. But I will not refrain from pointing out in a few instances (out of many) of conflicting evidence, which forms agree with the rhythmical habit of our author, and which are at variance with it. Thus in 24, 3 Knopf reads ἀνίσταται ἡμέρα; but the more natural cadence is afforded by C, ἀνίσταται ἡ ἡμέρα, with which Tischendorf's reading of A agrees. In 38, 2 Knopf reads μή λόγοις μόνον ἀλλ' ἐν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς. But C and A omit ἐν, and this omission yields such a rhythmical clausula as might be expected:

μὴ λόγοις | μόνον	non tantum verbis
ἀλλ' ἔργοις | ἀγαθοῖς.	sed et o|peribus | bonis.[1]

In 30, 6 Knopf reads, with A, ὁ ἔπαινος ἡμῶν ἔστω ἐν θεῷ, καὶ μὴ ἐξ αὐτῶν. But before θεῷ C affords τῷ and so gives the balance of clausulae which seems most natural:

ἔστω ἐν \| τῷ θεῷ
καὶ μὴ ἐξ \| αὐτῶν.

---

[1] The insertion of *et* shows the translator's desire to obtain, in addition to verbatim literalness, a suitable form of clausula.

But these are trifles, and indeed it is likely that text criticisms can expect little more from the disclosure of rhythmical technique than such considerations as may help to restore external form.

I am aware that there are many questions upon which I have not touched, and some, such as the matter of hiatus and elision which demand more thorough consideration. But I hope to have made it plain that I submit my results in no dogmatic spirit, but interrogatively, and in the hope that more competent students may give answer to some of the questions which I have raised.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

YALE UNIVERSITY, NEW HAVEN.

III.—THE ACCUSATIVE OF EXCLAMATION IN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE.

Ever since Ritschl brought the study of Plautus into fashion monographs on special points of Plautine syntax have been appearing with bewildering frequency, and, consequently, not the least merit of Professor W. M. Lindsay's recent book on the Syntax of Plautus (Oxford, 1907) is its collection in convenient summaries of the main conclusions reached by the authors of these monographs. For one thing, we can now see at a glance which subjects have been made the object of special study and which are still outstanding.

Among the few topics which are unsatisfactorily treated in Lindsay's book and for which no bibliographical references are given is the accusative of exclamation. Neglect of this construction, however, is not peculiar to Lindsay, but is shared by all books on Latin syntax . The treatment in the school grammars is especially unsatisfactory. Some of them do not so much as mention the fact that interjections ever accompany the construction; others content themselves with citing *o* (though in Plautus that is not even the most common interjection used) or *heu* (though that word never played an important rôle in the construction); and none, so far as I am aware, intimates that the accusative of exclamation has a history and a regular course of development like any other construction.

In the following discussion I have not considered several words that are generally included under this construction. For example, *em* is an old imperative form and the accusative after it is no more one of exclamation than it would be after the imperative of any other transitive verb; cf. Lindsay, op. cit., p. 137. Secondly, *pro* is often cited in this connection; cf. e. g., Harkness' Latin Grammar, § 421, but incorrectly; cf. Lindsay, p. 138. Again, *malum* (="the deuce") in interrogative expressions is sometimes explained as an accusative of exclamation; cf. Elmer's note on Phormio 723 and Ashmore's on Ad. 544, but it is almost certainly

an elliptical form of *malum tibi sit*; cf. Lindsay, p. 138. Further-more, I have not treated the various forms of *ecce*, which really demands and has already received separate consideration. Finally, I have in general been conservative in the matter, and, when another construction seemed possible or a verb could easily be supplied from the context, I have preferred to adopt such an explanation rather than to present under this head a large collection of examples, many of which might just as well be explained otherwise.[1]

Of all the interjections used with the accusative of exclamation in Plautus *edepol* is found the most frequently, occurring no less than twenty times; cf.

> Amph. frag. VI edepol hominem miserum[2]
> Asin. 292 edepol hominem infelicem, qui patronam comprimat
> Bacch. 293 edepol mortalis malos
> Cas. 848 edepol papillam bellulam
> Epid. 32 edepol facinus inprobum
> Epid. 686 edepol mancupium scelestum
> Merc. 204 f.   edepol cor miserum meum,
>   quod guttatim contabescit quasi in aquam indideris salem.
> Poen. 324 edepol Milphionem miserum
> Pseud. 519 edepol mortalem graphicum, si seruat fidem
> Pseud. 1205 edepol hominem uerberonem Pseudolum
> Rud. 686 edepol diem hunc acerbum
> Stich. 356 edepol rem negotiossam
> Trin. 128 edepol fide adulescentem mandatum malae
> Trin. 335 f. edepol hominem praemandatum ferme familiariter,
>   qui quidem nusquam per uirtutem rem confregit atque eget
> Trin. 591 ff.   di uostram fidem!
>   edepol re gesta pessume gestam probe,
>   si quidem ager nobis saluos est
> Trin. 890 edepol nomen nugatorium

---

[1] For example, Lindsay, op. cit., p. 30, cites Amph. 882 f.:

> durare nequeo in aedibus. ita me probri,
> stupri, dedecoris a uiro argutam meo

as an accusative of exclamation. It is rather an infinitive of exclamation; so Palmer, see note ad loc. in his edition and Lindsay himself elsewhere, p. 75. He also quotes Cist. 685 :

> ilicet me infelicem et scelestam.

But *me* is here the subject of the infinitive (*ire*); cf. Pseud. 16: licet me id scire.

[2] Citations follow Lindsay's edition of Plautus and Tyrrell's of Terence.

Sometimes *edepol* occurs in combination with *eu*; cf.

> Epid. 72 eu edepol res turbulentas
> Poen. 603 eu edepol mortalis malos
> Rud. 415 eu edepol specie lepida mulierem
> Truc. 695 eu edepol hominem nihili

It is noteworthy that, whenever in the above instances an adjective or participle occurs, it invariably follows the noun. In view of the number of examples this can scarcely be accidental.

In connection with *edepol* it is natural to consider *hercle* and *ecastor*.[1] The former occurs nine times; cf.

> Bacch. 999 malum quidem hercle magnum [2]
> Epid. 212 hercle rem gestam bene
> Miles 977 hercle occasionem lepidam
> Stich. 379 hercle rem gestam bene.

Sometimes *eu* is added to the phrase; cf.

> Men. 316 eu hercle hominem multum et odiosum mihi
> Men. 872 eu hercle morbum acrem ac durum
> Miles 394 eu hercle praesens somnium
> Miles 1056 eu hercle odiosas res
> Poen. 1107 f.   eu hercle mortalem catum,
>   malum crudumque et callidum et subdolum.

Ecastor occurs but twice, once in connection with *eu*; cf.

> Stich. 234 ecastor auctionem hau magni preti
> Miles 1066 eu ecastor hominem peiiurum.

It will be seen that also with these words the adjective regularly follows the noun, though there are two exceptions.

The four following examples are closely associated with those already considered; cf.

> Capt. 418 f.   di uostram fidem,
>   hominum ingenium liberale
> Most. 206 pro di inmortales, mulierem lepidam et pudico ingenio
> Trin. 501 pro di inmortales, condicionem quoiusmodi
> Trin. 1024 ita me di ament, graphicum furem.

---

[1] Needless to say, the use of these three words depends upon the sex of the speaker as much in combination with the accusative of exclamation as elsewhere; cf. Nicolson, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology IV (1893), pp. 99 ff.

[2] The unusual word order makes it extremely doubtful whether this example really illustrates the construction under consideration; but cf. Eun. 254.

21

Next to *edepol* Plautus uses *o* most frequently in this construction.   In four instances the modifier precedes; cf.

> Aul. 704 o lepidum diem
> Bacch. 136 o praeligatum pectus
> Miles 725 o lepidum caput
> Most. 55 o carnuficium cribrum. .

In the following eight cases the noun precedes; cf.

> Bacch. 759 o imperatorem probum
> Cas. 842 f.   o
>   corpusculum malacum
> Men. 640 o hominem malum
> Men. 1004 ff. o facinus indignum et malum, Epidamnii ciues, erum
>   meum hic in pacato oppido luci deripier in uia,
>   qui liber ad uos uenerit
> Most. 1071 o mortalem malum
> Pseud. 734 o hominem opportunum mihi
> Pseud. 931 o hominem lepidum
> Rud. 393 f.   o facinus inpudicum,
>   quam liberam esse oporteat seruire postulare

In one case a modifier both precedes and follows; cf.

> Miles 649 f. o lepidum semisenem, si quas memorat uirtutes habet,
>   atque equidem plane educatum in nutricatu Venerio.

Only two interjections remain to be considered, *heu* and *eugae*. The former occurs twice; cf.

> Aul. 721 heu me miserum, misere perii
> Merc. 624 heu me miserum ;

the latter occurs but once; cf.

> Bacch. 991 eugae litteras minutas.

It thus appears that in thirty-four instances in which interjections (other than *o*) are used with this construction in Plautus the modifier follows the noun in every case but four.   This ratio is so decisive that we must consider it intentional.   In the case of *o*, however, the proportion is so even that the word order must be thought to have been a matter of indifference with that interjection.

We have still to discuss the occurrence of this construction without any interjection at all.   This is both the most common form of the construction in Plautus and also the most interesting and difficult, since here the origin of the construction must be

sought. The accusative of exclamation is not a construction derived from the original Indo-European speech, hence its beginnings must be found within the Latin language itself. We have not far to seek. It has often been pointed out that many examples may be explained by the suppression of a verb. In this connection Lindsay (op. cit., p. 30) aptly quotes Rud. 1322 ff.:

> Gr. quid dare uelis qui istaec tibi inuestiget indicetque?
> eloquere propere celeriter. La. nummos trecentos. Gr. tricas.
> La. quadringentos. Gr. tramas putidas. La. quingentos. Gr. cassam
>   glandem.
> La. sescentos. Gr. curculiunculos minutos fabulare.
> La. dabo septingentos.

Here the outcome clearly shows that one speaker has been mentally supplying *dabo* and the other *fabularis* all the way through; yet we should be almost as certain of this, even if the words themselves had not finally been expressed. Often the presence of a personal pronoun in the nominative leaves no doubt as to the ellipse of a verb; cf. Cas. 319: quam tu mi uxorem? and Poen. 972: quid tu mihi testis? Other examples of suppressed verbs are Heauton 526 ff.:

> sed habet patrem quendam auidum misere atque aridum
> uicinum hunc: nostin? at quasi is non ditiis
> abundet, gnatus eius profugit inopia.
> scis esse factum ut dico? Ch. quid ego ni sciam?
> hominem pistrino dignum! Sy. quem? Ch. istunc seruolum
> dico adulescentis.

and Stich. 118: hau male istuc (sc. dixisti). Thus it appears that not only verbs appearing in the immediate context but also other verbs (especially, *dico, fabulor*, etc.) that do not so appear can be freely supplied as needed.

Another factor in the rise of the construction may be found in the use of the accusative as a "quoted" case. This usage is not confined to the accusative; a good example of a "quoted" genitive occurs in Poen. 472 ff.:

> sexaginta milia hominum uno die
> uolaticorum manibus occidi meis.
> Ly. uolaticorum—hominum?

"Quoted" datives are found in Men. 389 f.:

> egon te iussi coquere? Er. certo, tibi et parasito tuo.
> Men. quoi, malum, parasito? certe haec mulier non sanast satis.
> Er. Peniculo.

and Truc. 800 f.:

> erae meae extemplo dedit.
> Ca. quoi, malum, erae?

A "quoted" accusative is found in Capt. 450 f.:

> eadem opera a praetore sumam syngraphum. Ty. quem syngraphum?
> He. quem hic ferat secum ad legionem.

Nor must it be supposed that this idiom is restricted to the interrogative form; perhaps the most illuminating example is declarative; cf. Poen. 848 ff.:

> eru' nequiuit propitiare Venerem suo festo die.
> Mi. lepidam Venerem! Sy. nam meretrices nostrae primis hostiis
> Venerem placuere extemplo. Mi. o lepidam Venerem denuo.

In such a passage, then, we may see the origin of the construction both with and without an interjection. Yet I consider this not an example of the construction itself but only an approximation to it, for we can reproduce this effect in English without using an accusative of exclamation. In such "quoted" cases the noun (being a repetition) would usually be relatively unimportant, while any new element in the phrase would naturally be somewhat emphatic, and this emphasis would normally be indicated by the word order. Hence, in examples that owe their origin to the "quoted" case the modifier regularly precedes the noun.

Turning now to the actual examples of this construction, it must be granted in advance that the line of demarcation between the passages that illustrate the accusative of exclamation and those that only approximate it and show its derivation is often hard to draw and that I have both included in this list and omitted from it passages which others might have interpreted differently.[1] In the first place, we find several instances of *nugas,* which Lindsay (loc. cit., p. 30) places here, though *ago* or *dico* might be easily understood (cf. Asin. 91 and Men. 54); cf.

> Amph. 603 f. priu' multo ante aedis stabam quam illo adueneram.
>   Am. quas, malum, nugas? satin tu sanus es?
> Capt. 612 quid ais? quid si adeam hunc insanum? Ty. nugas! ludifica-
>   bitur.

---

[1] Thus, in Most. 642, Fay considers *speculo claras, candorem merum* accusatives of exclamation; cf. the note ad loc. in his edition. But *claras* clearly goes back to *aedis* in l. 640, and *candorem* is appositional.

Most. 1086 f.   seruos pollicitust dare
           suos mihi omnis quaestioni. Tr. nugas! numquam
             edepol dabit.
Persa 717 f.   quo illum sequar?
         in Persas? nugas!
Curc. 199 bene monstrantem pugnis caedis, hanc amas, nugas meras,

the last example is somewhat similar to the Greek accusative in apposition with a sentence.

Here belong also some examples of the personal pronoun; cf.

Amph. 1056 me miseram, quid agam nescio
Most. 739 me miserum,[1] occidi
Bacch. 1178 lepidum te.

The importance of this category will not appear until we consider Terence's usage.

In the remaining instances the modifier precedes in the following; cf.

Asin. 802 pulchre scripsti. scitum syngraphum!
Asin. 931 bellum filium
Bacch. 455 fortunatum Nicobulum, qui illum produxit sibi
Men. 713 rogas me? hominis inpudentem audaciam
Miles 248 nimi' doctum dolum
Miles 1385 facetum puerum
Poen. 1335 [bellum hominem, quem noueris]
Poen. 1384 bellum hominem, quem noueris
Pseud. 435 lepidum senem
Stich. 570 graphicum mortalem Antiphonem
Trin. 936 nimium graphicum hunc nugatorem.[2]

In the following examples the noun precedes its modifiers; cf.

Miles 837 bono subpromo et promo cellam creditam
Poen. 255 f. diem pulchrum et celebrem et uenustatis plenum,
         dignum Veneri pol, quoi sunt Aphrodisia hodie
Poen. 653 mortalis malos
Pseud. 366 cantores probos
Trin. 1035 f. petere honorem pro flagitio more fit. Ch. morem in-
         probum!
         St. strenuos <os> praeterire more fit. Ch. nequam
         quidem!

---

[1] Two examples of this phrase with *heu* have already been cited, p. 306.

[2] Perhaps Most. 926 eam dis gratiam atque animo meo ought to be added to the above list, but the text is very doubtful; cf. Fay ad loc.

Thus, out of twenty-five instances the modifier precedes in thirteen, and follows in eight, the four remaining cases counting neither way.

We may summarize the construction in Plautus as follows. It occurs some seventy-six times or about once in every two hundred and eighty-one verses. It is in a very plastic state, being used freely with or without interjections. Of the interjections used none seems to have the field to itself, but several are employed with about equal frequency. Without an interjection there is a tendency for the modifiers to precede their nouns, while with all interjections except *o* the modifiers almost invariably follow. With *o* the word order seems a matter of indifference.

When we turn to the usage in Terence, we find that a great change has taken place. *Edepol*, which played so prominent a rôle in Plautus, seems to occur but once; cf.

> Ad. 783 f. edepol comissatorem haud sane commodum,
> praesertim Ctesiphoni !! [1]

Hercle, likewise, is reduced to a single instance; cf.

> Eun. 254 scitum hercle hominem !

Of *ecastor* I have not found a single example accompanying this construction in Terence.[2]

In the case of the other forms of invocation, however, there seems to be no restriction; cf.

> Eun. 418 f.   di uostram fidem, hominem perditum
> miserumque et illum sacrilegum
> Eun. 943 pro deum fidem, facinus foedum ! o infelicem adulescentulum
> Phormio 1008 pro di inmortales, facinus miserandum et malum

---

[1] This passage disproves the assertion by Schmalz that " Der sog. Akk. exclamationis findet sich . . . . . verbunden . . . . mit *edepol* nur bei Plautus ", Iwan Müller's Handbuch II 2, p. 234. The statement of the whole subject given by Schmalz in this place is the best known to me, yet it is not free from slight inaccuracies of the sort noted. For example, he makes no mention of *hercle, ecastor*, or *eugae* as ever accompanying the construction.

[2] It is true that Terence uses these three words (*hercle, edepol*, and *ecastor*) only one half as often as Plautus; cf. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology IV (1893), p. 99; but the disproportion, when they are used with the accusative of exclamation, is still greater than this. Plautus employs them in this connection once in every 686 verses and Terence once in every 3037 verses; i. e., less than one-fourth as frequently.

Ad. 366 f.   pro Iuppiter,
         hominis stultitiam
Ad. 447 pro di inmortales, facinus indignum, Geta [1]
Ad. 757 f.   o Iuppiter,
         hancine uitam ! hoscin mores! hanc dementiam !

The use of *o* with the construction has suffered a great extension, completely overshadowing other interjections. The word order still seems a matter of no importance. In the following eleven instances the modifiers follow their nouns; cf.

And. 401 o facinus audax
And. 767 o facinus animum aduortendum
And. 769 o hominem audacem
Eun. 296 o faciem pulchram
Eun. 531 o capitulum lepidissumum
Phormio 233 f. o facinus audax, o Geta
Hec. 376 o facinus indignum, monitor [2]
Ad. 173 o facinus indignum
Ad. 183 o hominem inpurum
Ad. 304 o genera sacrilega, o hominem inpium.

It is noteworthy that nearly half of these examples (five) is furnished by *facinus*. As its modifiers here all begin with vowels, it is likely that the word order is largely due to a desire to avoid hiatus; cf. Afranius, Diuortium, frag. IV (Ribbeck): o dignum facinus, and the next footnote.

In the following eleven instances the modifiers precede; cf.

And. 876 o ingentem confidentiam
And. 948 o lepidum patrem
And. 956 o faustum et felicem diem
Heaut. 313 o hominis inpudentem audaciam
Eun. 70 o indignum facinus [3]
Eun. 298 o infortunatum senem
Eun. 365 o fortunatum istum eunuchum qui quidem in hanc detur
         domum

---

[1] If *quod* be read in the next line (so, e. g. Dziatzko), *facinus* is probably nominative.

[2] The proximity of a vocative does not preclude the use of the exclamatory accusative, cf. Horace, Sat. 1, 9, 11 f: o te, Bolane, cerebri felicem.

[3] Tyrrell follows Fleckeisen here in deleting *o*, while Fabia and Dziatzko retain it. The presence of *o* makes the scansion harsh by requiring at once elision, partial hiatus, and iambic shortening, supplícium ŏ ĭndígnum. In view of the usual word order in this phrase (see above) I think a better method of attack would be to reverse the order and read supplícium o fácinus ĭndígnum, which would remove all objections.

Eun. 709 Iuppiter magne, o scelestum atque audacem hominem
Eun. 943 f. pro deum fidem, facinus foedum! o infelicem adulescen-
tulum!
o scelestum Parmenonem, qui istum huc adduxit
Ad. 966 o lepidum caput

Four other examples should be cited here; cf.

Phormio 360 o audaciam
Phormio 559 o lepidum
Ad. 228 o scelera
Ad. 304 o scelera.

Eugae does not occur in this connection in Terence. A new word, however, makes its appearance; cf.

And. 589 uah consilium callidum,

unless this phrase be considered a nominative. *Heu* occurs thrice; cf.

And. 646 heu me miserum qui tuom animum ex animo spectaui meo
Hec. 271 heu me miseram
Hec. 282 heu me infelicem.

It will be noted that *heu* seems to be used only with personal pronouns, and that in four out of the five cases of its use in Plautus and Terence, it accompanies the phrase me miserum (-am), and the fifth instance is nearly the same (me infelicem).

The accusative of exclamation without an interjection is relatively far less important in Terence than in Plautus. In fact, it is for the most part confined to the phrase me miserum and its variations; cf.

And. 240 miseram me, quod uerbum audio
And. 788 me miseram
And. 882 me miserum
Heaut. 1029 miseram me
Eun. 81 miseram me, uereor ne, etc.
Eun. 197 me miseram
Phormio 749 miseram me
Hec. 205 me miseram, quae nunc quam ob rem accuser nescio
Ad. 291 miseram me, neminem habeo, solae sumus
Ad. 305 me miseram
Ad. 310 me miserum, uix sum compos animi
Ad. 329 f.   ah,
me miseram
Ad. 486 miseram me, differor doloribus.

It will be remembered that a few examples of this category in Plautus have already been cited (p. 309). If we consider the be-

ginning of the idiom, we shall understand why I was unable
to quote more instances there. This form of the accusative of
exclamation undoubtedly arose from the parenthetical use of the
adjective, the personal pronoun having a definite construction in
the sentence; cf. Amphit. 160: me miserum homines octo ualidi
caedant; Amphit. 897: eccum uideo qui <modo> me miseram
arguit, et passim. This attached use of the phrase is very com-
mon in Plautus and, of course, greatly reduces the examples of
the independent form. The second step in the development is
seen in such a sentence as Most. 739: me miserum, occidi, "as
for me, poor wretch, I am done for". Though in such a context
the phrase is really detached, it may be explained as a sort of
anacolouthon. Cf. also Eun. 81, Amph. 1056, Ad. 291, and Ad.
486 (quoted above). Such phrases would naturally be used with-
out an interjection, except occasionally *heu*, which is often
employed parenthetically. It is noticeable that the word order
is of no importance in this phrase. Thus, in twenty-one instances
of the personal pronoun in Plautus and Terence sixteen times no
interjection is used and five times *heu* is used; no other interjec-
tion ever occurs.[1]

Two examples of the interrogative pronoun, in which a verb is
harder to understand than usually in such phrases, may be
quoted; cf.

> Eun. 590 at quem deum! qui templa caeli summa sonitu concutit
> Phormio 367 at quem uirum! quem ego uiderim in uita optumum.

Also one instance with a demonstrative pronoun; cf. Ad. 304:

> hocine saeclum! o scelera, etc.

Of course, interjections never accompany the interrogative pro-
noun; for the demonstrative pronouns it is not possible to draw
a hard and fast rule; cf. Rud. 686; Trin. 936; Eun. 365, 418 f.,
and Ad. 757 f.

Only a few more examples remain; cf.

> And. 144 uenit Chremes postridie ad me clamitans:
> indignum facinus; comperisse Pamphilum
> pro uxore habere hanc peregrinam.[2]

---

[1] I agree with Lindsay op. cit., p. 29 in not considering Asin. 481: *vae te* an
accusative of exclamation; cf. Stich. 709: bene uos, bene nos, bene te, bene
me, bene nostram etiam Stephanium.

[2] So interpreted by Fairclough, see his note ad loc. It is equally possible
to supply the proper form of *sum* (here *esse*; cf. *comperisse*) as in so many other

And. 868 f.   o Chremes,
        pietatem gnati
Heaut. 380 [o][1] hominem felicem
Heaut. 530 hominem pistrino dignum
Phormio 134 iocularem audaciam
Phormio 259 artificem probum.[2]

The development of this construction may best be seen in the following table:

	Plautus.	Terence.
edepol	20	1
hercle	9	1
ecastor	2	—
other invocations	4	8
o	13	26
heu	2	3
eugae	1	—
uah	—	1
without interjections	25	22
Total	76	62

The first notable fact here illustrated is the increase in the frequency of the construction in Terence. He uses it once in every ninety-eight verses, or nearly three times as often as Plautus. This is partly due to the fact (already mentioned) that Plautus often preferred to leave such accusatives (which might easily have been made independent) in dependence upon some neighboring verb rather than to detach them entirely. The next point to notice is that the construction no longer has the plasticity that characterized it in Plautus. All the other interjections have disappeared or shrivelled into insignificance before the onsweep of *o*. Only *heu* maintains its ground, small though that may be, being occasionally used with the personal pronouns. Even the use without an interjection has been restricted to almost a single form, *me miserum*. The personal pronouns alone are invincible and

---

cases; cf. Phormio 613 f.: facinus indignum, Chremes, sic circumiri, Ad. 669: facinus indignum, pater, etc.

[1] Deleted by Fleckeisen. It might be better to retain the *o* and reverse the word order, ó felícem hominem ámbulá.

[2] Eun. 987: aliud ex alio malum is probably a nominative; cf. Heaut. 598: aliud ex alio incidit. In Ad. 330 ff.: nostrumne Aeschinum, nostram uitam omnium, in quo nostrae spes opesque omnes sitae erant Ashmore explains Aeschinum as subject of an infinitive to be supplied. In general, I have cited only such examples as could not easily be otherwise explained.

are never found with *o*.   In a single particular has the construc-
tion become more elastic than in Plautus ; viz., in the matter of
word order.   We have seen that in Plautus, when no interjection
is used, the modifiers usually precede their nouns and that they
usually follow their nouns, when an interjection (other than *o*) is
employed, while with *o* the word order is not fixed.   It naturally
follows that the triumph of the *o* category brought with it the
triumph of a free word order in this construction.

In subsequent papers I hope to show that the development
here indicated for this construction in Latin comedy continued
along similar lines for later writers and in other fields.

ROY C. FLICKINGER.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

The date of the meeting at Laeca's house is of prime importance for the chronology of a number of events connected with the conspiracy of Catiline—the passing of the *senatus decretum ultimum*, the attempt to murder Cicero at his home, the delivery of in Catilinam I and II, and the departure of Catiline from Rome. It is therefore fortunate that Cicero saw fit in p. Sulla 18, 52 to specify with great exactness the time at which the above mentioned meeting took place; namely, *nocte ea, quae consecuta est posterum diem Nonarum Novembrium.* But the very fact that the date is given so explicitly and phrased in a somewhat unusual fashion has tended to shake confidence more or less in the reliability of the one passage on which we must most depend in attempting to fix the dates of the events clustering around the well-known meeting in the scythe-makers' quarter. Yet the reasons for viewing the passage with suspicion are really far less cogent than one might at first sight assume.

Cicero obviously means to say that the meeting at Laeca's house took place on the night of November 6. It is true, as Mommsen early pointed out, that this interpretation of Cicero's words involves a dating forward from the Nones instead of backward from the Ides. But in questioning whether such a proceeding can be safely regarded as Ciceronian,[1] he apparently overlooked ad Att. XIII 13, 4 (14, 1):

si me in Tusculano postridie Nonas mane convenerint.

---

[1] Hermes I, p. 431 ff. His idea was that *posterum diem* meant " the day after (the consular election)", and that *Nonarum Novembrium* is an appositional genitive. According to this, the election was held on Nov. 4, and the meeting at Laeca's house occurred on the fifth. Without going into a detailed discussion of the whole question involved, it may be noted that this very passage shows conclusively that the election preceded the meeting at Laeca's house by a considerable interval of time. For Cicero admits that Sulla was in Rome on election day (§§ 51-52), but at the time of the meeting at Laeca's house Sulla was settled at Naples (§ 53). Therefore *posterum diem* could not mean " the day after (the consular election)."

Again, the use of the genitive called for by this interpretation finds a close parallel in ad Att. III 7, 1 :

<div align="center">post diem tertium eius diei.[1]</div>

And finally, the designation of time by means of a somewhat clumsy periphrase is by no means unparalleled in Cicero's writings; e. g.,

> ad Quint. Fr. III 2, 1 : postridie eius diei, qui erat tum futurus, cum haec scribebam.
> ad Att. XV 26, 1 : ea nocte, quae proxima ante Kal. fuit.
> p. Flacco 41, 103 : nox illa, quam iste est dies consecutus.

So far, therefore, as the phrase itself is concerned, there would seem to be no valid reason for viewing the text with suspicion or for hesitating to accept the interpretation which gives to the words their simple face value.

Taken in connection with its context, however, the phrase in question may seem to be open to more serious objection, and it is to this aspect of the matter particularly that the present note invites attention. At the point in his speech where he gives the date of the meeting at Laeca's house Cicero is dealing with a charge against Sulla brought forward by the informer C. Cornelius—a charge so lacking in definiteness that Cicero professed not to understand what Cornelius really means to say. His method of refutation, therefore, is to suggest several occasions when the conspirators were active, endeavoring to show that, in each case, Sulla could not have been associated with them. Thus, he first asks whether Cornelius has in mind the earlier conspiracy (of 66–65 B. C.),—mentioning no date, however, and referring to the occasion in terms so general that we might be in doubt as to his meaning, had we not access to other parts of this speech.[2] He then passes to the postponed consular election of his own year (63)—the date of which we should be very glad to know—but says nothing more definite than *consularibus comitiis, quae a me habita sunt.* In the third place he takes up the matter of the meeting at Laeca's house, and in the following terms: quid tandem de illa nocte dicit (Cornelius), cum inter falcarios ad

[1] Cf. John, Jahrbücher f. Klass. Philologie, Supplementband VIII, p. 778 footnote; also T. D. i 47, 114 : *post eius diei diem tertium*; and ad Att. IX 10, 4 : *post diem quartum quam ab urbe discessimus.*

[2] His words are: si vetera, mihi ignota, cum Hortensio communicata, respondit Hortensius.

M. Laecam, *nocte ea, quae consecuta est posterum diem Nonarum Novembrium me consule*, Catilinae denuntiatione convenit?

It must be admitted that, from the point of view of their context and setting, there is something very peculiar about the words *nocte ea . . . . . me consule.* For it is not at all evident why, at this point, Cicero should feel it necessary or even desirable to date to a day the meeting at Laeca's house—a date which, from its close proximity to the time of in Catilinam I and the departure of Catiline from Rome, was perhaps even more clearly fixed in the minds of the hearers than was that of the postponed consular election, over which he had just passed so lightly. Still less is it clear why he should employ an unusual periphrastic form of dating—a device to which he has recourse, sometimes at least,[1] in order to make the designation of the time clear beyond the peradventure of a doubt. Add to these considerations the fact that the phrase in question is a parenthesis pure and simple, and it is not strange that some have been found who are ready to bracket the words. It would, however, be more to the point to cast about for a reason that might have led Cicero to word his sentence as it stands in the text.

Repeated readings of the passage and of other parts of this speech suggest the thought that the words *ea nocte . . . . . Nonarum Novembrium* may not have been original with Cicero, but rather are a quotation from an official document—the somewhat otiose and insipid *me consule* which he appends is just the sort of tag a person is prone to add who has mechanically and in one breath run through some round-about and redundant quoted phrase. If there be any truth in this suggestion, the document from which the quotation was made was without doubt the official record of the evidence presented before the senate on Dec. 3 of the previous year, at the time when the Allobroges gave their damaging evidence against Catiline's accomplices. For, in preparing the present speech in defence of Sulla on the charge of conspiracy, Cicero had found it necessary to look through the official record of the evidence presented on that day (see his quotations from it, §§ 36–38), and I venture to suggest that, as his eye ran along the page, his attention was arrested by the rather uncommon phrase *nocte ea . . . . . Nonarum Novembrium*, and that he incorporated it in his speech (along with the tag *me consule*) as giving a formal

[1] As in ad Quint. Fr. III 2, 1 above.

and official tone to the passage.   In order to show how such a
phrase might have found a place in the record of the proceedings
before the senate on Dec. 3, 63, it is necessary to look rather
carefully into the happenings of that day.

One might gather from the summary account given by Cicero
in Catilinam III, §§ 8–15, that the session of the senate on Dec. 3
was a somewhat hurried affair.   But § 21 of the same speech
shows that the senate gathered early in the morning, and § 29
makes it clear that it was far into the afternoon when Cicero at last
found himself free to come forth and relieve the curiosity of the
assembled citizens.   The senate meeting, therefore, was almost
an all-day session.   Furthermore, no inconsiderable portion of
the time was given to the taking of testimony from the Allobroges
and others—the witnesses had opportunity to tell all they knew,
and by no means restricted their remarks to the cases of the four
luckless culprits who had not been shrewd enough to avoid arrest.
For their testimony clinched the cases of five others who were
not present—persons whom Cicero names in Catilinam III 6, 14,
adding in every case but one a clause descriptive of the charges
brought against the man; and still other individuals, such
as Autronius and Sulla, were discussed by the witnesses[1]—persons
against whom apparently the evidence did not seem strong
enough to warrant the inclusion of their names in the decree of
the senate passed on that day.   Finally, the testimony was taken
down in the greatest detail and with the minutest care by specially
qualified rapid writers,[2] whose report was a marvel of accuracy
and precision.[3]

Now if an unimportant conspirator like Sulla came in for his
share of attention in the testimony of the Allobroges, it cannot be
doubted that they had something to say of Laeca also—especially
as he, like Sulla, was subsequently brought to trial[4] although they
both escaped for the time being.   I therefore suggest that the
phrase *nocte ea* . . . . . *Nonarum Novembrium* may have found
a place in the official record of the day's proceedings by being
taken down verbatim from the testimony of the Allobroges.   If
they mentioned Laeca at all, it would naturally be in connection

---

[1] Cf. p. Sulla, §§ 36–38.   [2] P. Sulla, §§ 41–42.

[3] As shown by the surprising detail and precision with which the testimony
of the Allobroges concerning Sulla is recorded ibid., §§ 36 ff.   For the means
used to make the official record absolutely trustworthy see ibid., §§ 41–42.

[4] Ibid. 3, 6.

with the meeting held at his house; and that the date of this meeting figured in their testimony is by no means incredible in view of the minute and careful manner in which they prosecuted their bit of detective work when set on by Cicero to gather incriminating evidence against the conspirators.[1]

On this hypothesis the fact that the date takes the form *nocte ea quae consecuta est posterum diem Nonarum Novembrium* should occasion no surprise. For this style of dating forward from the Nones (instead of backward from the Ides) is one that would appeal to barbarians perhaps none too familiar with the intricacies of the usual Roman method. Being told that the commissions of the conspirators were given out at an important night meeting held at the house of M. Laeca *ante diem octavum Idus Novembris*, the ambassadors may well have reduced this formula to another which conveyed a more definite idea to their own minds and which was easier to remember; or, on the other hand, their informant at their request may have specified the time more clearly by the use of the phrase *nocte ea . . . . . Nonarum Novembrium*; i. e., "on the night of the day following the Nones." At any rate such a phrase is precisely of the kind one would expect a Roman to use in explaining a date to a foreigner not very expert in the regular method of dating. It is quite conceivable, therefore, that through the testimony of the Allobroges taken down verbatim this rather unusually phrased date found a place in the official record of the day's proceedings.

To resume, there is nothing in the wording of the phrase *nocte ea . . . . . me consule* itself to justify a doubt as to the soundness of the text or the correctness of the interpretation which gives to the words their obvious face value—so far as wording and interpretation are concerned, the phrase might have been original with Cicero. But from the point of view of the context, the presence of the words in the sentence in which they

---

[1] An example showing the thorough-going and aggressive nature of their method is afforded by their interview with Cassius quoted from the official record of the testimony (p. Sulla, §§ 36–38). Cassius had told them that Autronius was in the conspiracy; and then, when he would have rested there, they took the initiative and asked whether Sulla (who in 66 had been elected consul with Autronius, and with him had been disqualified for bribery) was not also a conspirator. That such sharp and accurate agents as these got hold of the date of the meeting at Laeca's house and that they mentioned it in their testimony is altogether likely.

stand presents a difficulty which, at first sight, appears serious. This difficulty, however, should not lead to the rejection of the phrase; for its presence can be accounted for on a plausible hypothesis; for example, that Cicero catches up a striking clause (*nocte ea* . . . . . *Nonarum Novembrium*) from the record of the evidence presented on December 3, 63 (which evidence he had just been examining), and gives a formal and official tone to his sentence by inserting the phrase bodily and adding the tag *me consule*. Such insertion would be all the more effective in view of the fact that many copies of the official record of the evidence had already been made and scattered broadcast during the months that intervened before the speech pro Sulla was delivered;[1] so that in incorporating the phrase he would be quoting something more or less familiar to many of his hearers.

H. C. NUTTING.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

[1] P. Sulla, §§ 42–43.

V.—ULPIAN ο κειτογκειτοσ.

The Influence of the Stoic Theory of Style in Athenaeus.

In a previous investigation[1] I have shown that the archaism of Fronto and Gellius was an outgrowth of the striving for Latinitas and ἑλληνισμός which constituted the Stoic ideal of style. The belief that the diction of the golden age was pure and unperverted had led the Stoics to seek for their models of style among the most ancient writers. Homer was ἑλληνισμός, or the ἀρχαῖοι, or else the basis of ἑλληνισμός was etymology that determined the earliest meaning of words. In this note I wish to present further evidence of the archaizing tendency of ἑλληνισμός from the pages of Athenaeus, giving particular attention to the person of one of the interlocutors, Ulpian the lawyer. The Stoics had done much for Roman law, as the names of the Aelii and Scaevolae attest. By their etymological and lexicographical studies they had striven to give the law terminology a precision that should free it from all ambiguity. Quintilian's statement (5, 14, 34): iurisconsulti, quorum summus circa verborum proprietatem labor est, can be confirmed by hundreds of citations from the Digest.[2]

Ulpian, whatever his philosophy may have been, had inherited from his Stoic predecessors in the law their traditions about

---

[1] Latinitas and ἑλληνισμός, Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, Philology and Literature Series III, pp 205–272.

[2] Cf. Gellius 7, 12, 5 where Trebatius' etymology of sacellum is given; Gellius 16, 5, 3: Aelius Gallus in libro de significatione verborum quae ad ius civile pertinent secundo; Gellius 13, 10, 1: Labeo Antistius iuris quidem civilis disciplinam principali studio exercuit, . . . ceterarum quoque bonarum artium non expers fuit et in grammaticam sese atque dialecticam litterasque antiquiores altioresque penetraverat Latinarumque vocum origines rationesque percalluerat eaque praecipue scientia ad enodandos plerosque iuris laqueos utebatur. Then follows the additional statement that three books of his "Posteriores" were devoted largely to etymological studies. Vid. Emerton's Stoic Terminology in Roman Law, Law Quarterly Review III 64.

purity and precision of diction.[1] His painstaking search for the
exact word among the ancients, had given him the nick-name of
Κειτούκειτος among his contemporaries. In introducing the inter-
locutors of the dialogue, Athenaeus makes the following statement
about Ulpian: (1 d e) "And there was present a crowd of rheto-
ricians in no respect inferior to the cynics. These last, and all the
rest who opened their mouths, were run down by Ulpian the
Tyrian, who because of the persistent questions which he kept
asking at every hour of the day, in the streets, in the walks, in
the book-shops, and at the baths, had won for himself the name
of Κειτούκειτος which was better known than his real name. This
man had the habit peculiar to himself of never taking a bite of
anything until he had said : "Does it occur? or does it not occur?
(κεῖται ἢ οὐ κεῖται;). For example whether the word ὥρα occurs as
applying to a part of the day, whether the word μέθυσος occurs as
applying to a man, whether the word μήτρα occurs as applying to
any eatable food, whether the compound σύαγρος occurs as
applying to a boar."

Later on in the dialogue Ulpian shows by citations from the
ancient Attic comedy that μέθυσος is a term that may apply to a
man as well as to a γραῦς, that μήτρα, while it usually has a different
signification, may be applied as a name to an article of diet, that
σύαγρος may mean boar even though Sophocles has used it with
the meaning 'hound.'

That it may be perfectly evident that this nickname Κειτούκειτος
was simply a brand for this archaizing tendency, I wish to present
a few passages in corroboration.

(126 a) "Fill yourself now, O Ulpian, with your native
Chthordlapsus, a word which has not, I swear by Ceres, been
used by any one of the ancient writers" (παρ' οὐδενὶ τῶν παλαιῶν
γέγραπται).

Ulpian had censured Cynulcus for his use of the word δηκόκταν;
Cynulcus replied: (122 c, e) "If now I have made a blunder, O

---

[1] Perhaps the most striking example of Ulpian's indebtedness to the Stoics
may be found in his definition of jurisprudence which occurs at the very
opening of the Institutes of Justinian. " Jurisprudentia est divinarum atque
humanarum rerum notitia, iusti atque iniusti scientia". This is simply a
combination of the Stoic definitions of σοφία and φρόνησις. οἱ μὲν οὖν Στωικοὶ
ἔφασαν τὴν μὲν σοφίαν εἶναι θείων τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων ἐπιστήμην. (Plutarch, De
Plac. Phil. 2.) φρόνησιν εἶναι ἐπιστήμην κακῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ οὐδετέρων. (Diog.
Laert. Life of Zeno 7, 92.)

you hunter of fine nouns and verbs, don't be angry . . . . I will prove to you that the ancients (οἱ ἀρχαῖοι) were acquainted with this word δηκόκταν." Then follows a citation from Alexis.

(362 a) " My fine fellow", said Ulpian laughing, "what Greek in the world ever called dancing βαλλισμός ? You should have said κωμάζουσι or χορεύουσι or at all events some word in common use; but you have brought up a word from the Subura". The use of βαλλισμός is justified by citations from ancient authors. Attention perhaps may be given in passing to the expression "you have brought up a word out of the Subura", calling to mind the fact that the Stoics thus defined κατασκευή, their fifth virtue of style: κατασκευὴ δέ ἐστι λέξις ἐκπεφευγυῖα τὸν ἰδιωτισμόν (Diog. Laert. Life of Zeno VII 59).

(401 d, e) " You always, O Ulpian, have got a habit of never taking anything that is set before you until you know whether the existing name of it was in use among the ancients". (πρὶν μαθεῖν εἰ ἡ χρῆσις μὴ εἴη τῶν ὀνομάτων παλαιά.)

(380 d) And Ulpian said, " I swear by those who risked their lives at Artemisium, no one shall taste of anything before we are told where the word παραφέρω occurs". (ποῦ κεῖται τὸ παραφέρειν.)

(127 a) " I will stop eating", said Ulpian, "unless some one shall tell me παρὰ τίσιν εἴρηνται οὗτοι οἱ χόνδροι". Some one cites from ancient comedy a passage containing the word.

(396 a) When some one said, "Give me a plate of that smothered (πνικτῶν) meat", that Daedalus of names, Ulpian said, " I myself shall be smothered if you do not tell me where you found any mention of meat of that kind". Then follow citations from comedy.

(126 a) " Give me", said Ulpian, "some crust of bread hollowed out like a spoon, for I will not say give me a spoon (μύστρον) since that word is not used by any of the writers previous to our time". Ulpian is proved wrong by a citation from Nicander of Colophon who is characterized as φιλάρχαιος.

(58 b) κεῖται παρά τινι τὸ πρόπομα;
(100 b) ὁ κοιλιοδαίμων παρὰ τίνι κεῖται;
(115 b) ὁ δ' ἀπελεύθερος παρὰ τίνι κεῖται;
(165 d) καὶ τὸ ἀσώτιον ποῦ κεῖται;
(366 a) παρὰ τίνι κεῖται τὸ τακερόν;
(385 b) ποῦ κεῖται, ἔφη, ὀξάλμη;
(445 c) ὁ δὲ πάροινος παρὰ τίνι κεῖται;

These questions ποῦ κεῖται, and παρὰ τίνι κεῖται that recur so often in the pages of Athenaeus, are answered in seven cases out of ten by one or more citations from comedy. To be sure, there are more quotations from Homer than from any other single author, for Homer was regarded as ἑλληνισμός itself, because of his antiquity. And yet, as has been said, the great bulk of the citations are from the pages of comedy. This fact becomes significant when we remember that the diction of comedy, as Horace pointed out (Sat. I 4, 45 ff.), is nothing more than "sermo" in metrical form. Now the plain style (τό ἰσχνόν) of the Stoics required as its basis the "sermo cotidianus", for it was the style διὰ τῶν κυρίων τε καὶ κοινῶν καὶ ἐν μέσῳ κειμένων ὀνομάτων ἐκφέρουσα τὰ νοούμενα (Dionys. Lysias 3). Quintilian makes it plain that he regarded comedy as the source of the "sermo purus et incorruptus", when he says (1, 8, 9): In comoediis elegantia et quidam velut ἀττικισμός inveniri potest; and again (10, 1, 65) antiqua comoedia cum sinceram illam sermonis Attici gratiam prope sola retinet. . . . . Nam et grandis et elegans et venusta, et nescio an ulla, post Homerum tamen, quem ut Achillem semper excipi par est, aut similior sit oratoribus aut ad oratores faciendos aptior. That the source of this view of the diction of comedy is Stoic, comes out (10, 1, 99) where Quintilian quotes the opinion of the Stoic Aelius Stilo: "Musas Plautino sermone locuturas fuisse, si Latine loqui vellent."

Ulpian not only bowed before the authority of ancient writers, but he also regarded as a proper basis for ἑλληνισμός those etymological studies which sought out the earliest meanings of words. He prefers σῦς to ὗς on etymological grounds (401 c); the form σίναπυ is justified by tracing out its etymology (367 a). In two cases (659 a and 686 f.) etymologies are cited on the authority of Chrysippus. Many similar instances can be given, where the authority quoted is manifestly a Stoic one.[1]

In many of the previous citations there has been apparent that striving after κυριολογία, ἀκρίβεια (verbal exactness, precision in diction) which constituted one of the virtues of the plain style of the Stoics. A few more examples, however, more directly to the point, may make the matter clearer.

(97 c) Cynulcus scourges Ulpian because in several instances he has been guilty of inaccurate use of words, in spite of the fact

---

[1] Cf. Cicero, De Officiis I 23 : audeamus imitari Stoicos, qui studiose exquirunt unde verba sint ducta.

that he spends all his time in asking κεῖται οὐ κεῖται; εἴρηται οὐκ εἴρηται.

(49 a–c) Ulpian becomes indignant at one of the cynics because he has used τρίπους in the sense of τράπεζα. Ulpian is proved wrong by citations from ancient authors.

(408 f) Ulpian speaking: "Among the ancients the way in which people washed their hands before breakfast and supper was called κατὰ χειρός, but what was done after these meals was called ἀπονίψασθαι."

In the eleventh book of the dialogue at the suggestion of Ulpian, they discuss drinking cups. More than a hundred different varieties are named, and in nearly every case the name is justified by a citation from an ancient author. In many instances the etymology is traced. A large part of the information for this discussion is drawn from the περὶ τῆς Νεστορίδος of Asclepiades of Myrlea, who was a follower of the Stoic philosopher, Crates of Mallos.[1]

It is obvious that the portrait of Ulpian which Athenaeus here presents is a caricature. But that it may be apparent that there was some basis of fact for the caricature, I wish to give a considerable number of citations from that part of the Digest which was drawn from Ulpian. These excerpts will show conclusively that he was deeply devoted to the Stoic virtue of κυριολογία, that he strove to be precise in his diction and that very often etymology helped to a nice—perhaps in some cases to an overnice differentiation of words.

D. 47, 8, 4, 3: Labeo inter *turbam* et *rixam* multum interesse ait: namque turbam multitudinis hominum esse turbationem et coetum, rixam etiam duorum.

D. 47, 10, 5, 1: Inter *pulsationem* et *verberationem* hoc interest: verberare est cum dolore caedere, pulsare sine dolore.

D. 50, 16, 67: '*Alienatum*' non proprie dicitur, quod adhuc in dominio venditoris manet: '*venditum*' tamen recte dicetur.

D. 50, 16, 63: *Penes te* amplius quam *apud te*: nam apud te est, quod qualiter qualiter a te teneatur, penes te est, quod quodam modo possidetur.

D. 50, 16, 131: Differentiation of *fraus, poena, multa.*

D. 50, 16, 197: *Indicasse* est detulisse: *arguisse* accusasse et convicisse.

---

[1] Vid. Susemihl, Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandriner Zeit II 17.

D. 50, 16, 31: *Pratum* est, in quo ad fructum percipiendum falce dumtaxat opus est; ex eo dictum, quod *paratum* sit ad fructum capiendum.

D. 47, 10, 1: *Iniuria* ex eo dicta est, quod *non iure* fiat.

D. 50, 16, 59: Etymology of *portus*.

D. 50, 16, 176: Etymology of *solutio*.

D. 50, 16, 212: Etymology of *praevaricatores*.

Out of one chapter of the Digest (50, 16) can be gathered more than seventy similar examples from Ulpian. It appears that this Stoic virtue of style κυριολογία, with its kindred archaizing tendency that often manifested itself in etymological studies, were for Ulpian matters of practical importance, necessary to precision of definition in the law. And so it is not strange that, when he dined with the deipnosophists, this should be his principal topic of conversation, in the discussion of which he could out-rhetorician even the rhetoricians.

It is a rare bit of poetic justice that Ulpian's Latinity was severely criticized by the purists of the Renaissance. Browning's bishop, in giving directions for his epitaph, is but echoing the Elegantiae of Laurentius Valla, when he casts slurs upon Ulpian's bad Latin.

> " That's if ye carve my epitaph aright,
>   Choice Latin, picked phrase, Tully's every word,
>   No gaudy ware like Gandolf's second line—
>   Tully, my masters? Ulpian serves his need!"
>
>   *   *   *   *   *
>
> " And marble's language, Latin pure, discreet,
>   Aha, *Elucescebat* quoth our friend?
>   No Tully, said I, Ulpian at the best!"

<div style="text-align:right">CHARLES N. SMILEY.</div>

IOWA COLLEGE.

NOTE.—Christ (Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur, p. 736 f.) and Roby (Introduction to Justinian's Digest, p. 198 f.) object to an identification of the two Ulpians on the ground that they agree " neither in profession, nor character, nor death " (Roby). In this note I wish to call attention to three points bearing on the question, the second of which seems to have been overlooked and the third to have been misapprehended by both Christ and Roby.

(1) Ulpian the jurist makes the following statement concerning his place of birth: In Syria Phoenice splendidissima Tyriorum colonia, unde mihi origo est. Ulpian the deipnosophist is repeatedly referred to as a Tyrian and Syrian (669 b, 649 c, 1 d).

(2) As to the profession of Ulpian the deipnosophist, Roby infers that he was a rhetorician. But Athenaeus does not include him in his enumeration of the rhetoricians who participated in the feast, and nowhere in the dialogue does he call him a ῥήτωρ. In the introduction (1 d, e) he makes it clear that Ulpian could beat the rhetoricians at their own game, but in this very statement, there is the implication that he was not a rhetorician. In another passage (150 a, b) a question arises concerning a certain Alexandrian law— and the reason for the law. The matter is referred for explanation not to Masurius who has been pointed out as a great lawyer (1 c and 623 e) but to Ulpian. This incident, from which it may be reasonably inferred that Ulpian the deipnosophist was a lawyer, seems to have been overlooked.

(3) Ulpian the jurist died a violent death at the hands of the pretorian guard (Dio 80, 2). Athenaeus says (686 c) concerning the death of Ulpian the deipnosophist: ἀπέθανεν εὐτυχῶς, οὐδένα καιρὸν νόσῳ παραδούς. On the authority of this statement it has been inferred that he died a peaceful death. Christ says: "unser Tischgenosse aber eines ruhigen Todes starb". This interpretation might be accepted if we had an unqualified εὐτυχῶς; but εὐτυχῶς is limited in its application by the following clause οὐδένα καιρὸν νόσῳ παραδούς; i. e.. his death was fortunate in that he did not suffer the pains of a lingering illness—he gave no opportunity to the ravages of disease. This statement might apply to one who had died of apoplexy; it would apply equally well to one who had been cut down by the pretorian guard. There is no necessary contradiction between Dio's account of the death of the jurist, and the statement of Athenaeus concerning the death of the deipnosophist.

VI.—THE GREEK DICTYS.

The long-standing controversy as to whether or no the Latin Ephemeris Belli Trojani, preserved under the name of Dictys Cretensis (ed. F. Meister, Teubner, Leipsic, 1872), rests upon a Greek original[1] has at length been settled in the affirmative by the recent discovery of a fragment of the Greek Dictys. The fragment in question was found in the winter of 1899–1900 in the Egyptian town of Umm el Baragât (the ancient Tebtunis) on the back of a series of revenue returns dated 206 A. D. and is published by the discoverers in Tebtunis Papyri Vol. II, pp. 9 ff., London, 1907. Comparison of the fragment, which is short and badly mutilated, with the corresponding portions of the extant versions of Dictys proves beyond a doubt that it forms part of the long-lost[2] Greek text.[3]

The annals of Dictys Cretensis survive in four mutually independent versions, the Latin Ephemeris Belli Trojani of the fourth century A. D.,[4] and three later Greek versions, embodied in Byzan-

---

[1] The evenly balanced state of critical opinion upon this much-mooted question finds apt illustration in the equivocal attitude of the early Dictys controversialist Gerhardus J. Vossius, who in 1624 spoke out in favor of a Greek Dictys (De Historicis Graecis III 428), but in the year 1627 retracted his former opinion in the oft-quoted words: "Quisquis auctor est ejus operis, Latine, non Graece, scripsit" (De Historicis Latinis III 742). From that day to this the history of the Dictys controversy presents a succession of alternations between these two extremes. Lehrs (Wissenschaftliche Monatsblätter VI 131 ff.) in 1878 and Teuffel in 1890 (Römische Literatur—Geschichte II § 423) express themselves as undecided, and in more recent years the elaborate argument brought forward in defense of a Greek Dictys in 1892 by F. Noack (Philologus, Supplementband VI 402 ff.) failed to convince W. Greif, who in his Neue Untersuchungen zur Dictys-und-Daresfrage, Berlin, 1900, attempts to uphold the theory of a Latin Dictys. For a more extended review of the history of critical opinion on this subject cf. my Dares and Dictys, Baltimore, 1907, p. 18, note 3.

[2] As early as the fifteenth century, Constantine Lascaris reports that he has searched for the Greek Dictys in vain (Gronovius, Thesaurus X 1745).

[3] Not, however, in all probability, of that text in its original purity (cf. p. 335).

[4] This date is rendered probable by the style and content of the Latin text; cf. my Dares and Dictys, p. 3, note 2.

tine world chronicles, by Joannes Malalas[1] (sixth century), Joannes Antiochenus[2] (seventh century), and Georgius Cedrenus[3] (eleventh century), respectively. It is my present purpose to inquire what light the newly discovered fragment sheds upon the relation of these versions to their original and to one another.

To begin with the Latin Ephemeris. The Greek fragment proves, in the first place, that a certain Lucius Septimius, who, in an epistle prefixed to the Latin text, claims that he has translated the ensuing annals of Dictys from the Greek (Meister, p. 1, l. 16), was not, as the advocates of a Latin Dictys had maintained, the author of these annals,[4] but, as he himself declares, merely the translator of an earlier work written in Greek.[5]

In the second place, the fragment accurately bears out a further assertion made by Septimius in his epistle with regard to the

---

[1] Malalas' version of Dictys occupies the greater portion of the fifth book of his Χρυνογραφία. The Χρονογραφία no longer survives in its original form but is represented by two condensed transcripts, one, of practically the entire history, in an Oxford MS, edited by Dindorf in Niebuhr, Corp. Script. Hist. Byz., Bonn, 1831, and the other, of the history of Dictys merely, in a Paris MS entitled Ἐκλογὴ ἱστοριῶν, edited by Cramer, Anecdota Graeca II 197–227, Oxford, 1839 (cf. my Dares and Dictys, pp. 36, 45 ff.).

[2] John of Antioch's version of Dictys is preserved in three sets of fragments : (1) the Constantine fragments, ed. Cramer, Anecd. Paris, 1839, II 4, l.3—5, l.13, and C. Mueller, Frag. Hist. Graec., 1851, IV 550, fr. 23, 551, fr. 25 ; (2) the Salmasian fragments, ed. Cramer II 390 ff., and Mueller, p. 550, fr. 24 ; and (3) certain fragments embedded in the chronicle of John of Sicily, ed. H. Heinrich, Die Chronik des Johannes Sikeliota, Graz, 1892, pp. 8–10.

[3] Cedrenus' version of Dictys is contained in his Σύνοψις ἱστοριῶν, ed. Bekker in Niebuhr, op. cit., Bonn, 1838.

[4] Thus Dunger (Dictys-Septimius, Berlin, 1878, p. 3, note 2) and Greif (op. cit., pp. 5–7) contend that the claim of translation from the Greek was contrived by Septimius merely as a blind in order to disguise his own authorship of annals which he has already ascribed (epis., ed. Meister, p. 1, ll. 1–14) to the eye-witness Dictys.

[5] The recovery of the fragment thus confirms the validity of the argument that a forged history of the Trojan war is to be looked upon rather as the product of the inventive Greek than of the practical Roman mind (cf. Gudeman, Transactions of the American Philological Association XXV 150 ff.), particularly in view of the fact that the names of other authors (real or imaginary) to whom Trojan annals have been attributed—as Dares the Phrygian by Ptolemaeus Chennus (Καινὴ ἱστορία, ed. from Photius by Roulez, p. 147 a 24), Syagrius by Aelian (Varia Historia XIV 21), Sisyphus of Cos and Phidalius of Corinth by Malalas (ed. Bekker, op. cit., p. 117, ll. 1 and 14), Palamedes and Corinnus the Ilian by Suidas (Lexicon s. v.)—are, in every case, Greek (cf. my Dares and Dictys, pp. 108–109). The fragment moreover

manner in which he performed his task of translation. This he describes as follows: nobis cum in manus forte libelli venissent, avidos verae historiae cupido incessit ea uti erant Latine disserere, non magis confisi ingenio, quam ut otiosi animi desidiam discuteremus (Meister, p. 1, ll. 14-18). If now, taking the words "uti erant Latine disserere" to mean a loose paraphrase as distinguished from a literal translation,[1] we compare the claim of Septimius with his actual practice, we find that he is, as a matter of fact, at constant pains to expand the wording of his original. Thus he renders the Greek: πένθος δὲ οὐ μικρὸν τοῖς ἐν Ἰλίῳ ἐγένετο Τρωίλου ἀπολομένου. ἦν γὰρ ἔτι νέος καὶ γενναῖος καὶ [ὡραῖος[2]] (Tebtunis Papyri II, p. 12, l. 12—p. 13, l. 14) by the Latin Troiani tollunt gemitus et clamore lugubri Troili casum miserandum in modum deflent recordati aetatem eius admodum immaturam, qui in primis pueritiae annis cum verecundia ac probitate, tam praecipue forma corporis amabilis atque acceptus popularibus adolescebat (Meister, p. 76, ll. 9-14). The foregoing passage further reveals the groundlessness of the attempt of the advocates of a Latin Dictys to find in the frequent and indubitable instances in Septimius of phrasal indebtedness to earlier Latin authors[3] evidence that the Ephemeris could not have been a translation.[4] For the expression "qui in primis pueritiae annis cum verecundia ac probitate, tam praecipue forma corporis amabilis atque acceptus popularibus adolescebat", which is cited by Pratje[5] as an ex-

---

creates an initial presumption in favor of regarding the Trojan annals of Dares the Phrygian, which, like those of Dictys, claim to come from the Greek, but survive only in Latin form, as, in like manner, derived from an earlier Greek prototype.

[1] Cf. E. Patzig, Dictys Cretensis, Byz. Zs. I 151.

[2] Apparently to be supplied in the fragment, which is here blank, from Malalas (Mal. 130, 5), as shown by the Latin forma corporis.

[3] Chiefly from Sallust, Virgil, and Cicero; cf. Pratje, 1874, Quaestiones Sallustianae, passim; Lehrs, 1878, op. cit., pp. 137 ff.; Brünnert, 1883, Sallust u. Dictys Cretensis, passim; Dunger, 1886, De Dictys-Septimio Virgilii imitatore, passim; Teuffel, 1890, loc. cit.; Noack, 1892, op. cit., pp. 451 ff.; and Griffin, 1907, op. cit., pp. 114 ff.

[4] Cf. Joly, 1870, Benoît de Ste. More et le Roman de Troie II 185 ff.; Meister, 1872, preface to edition of Dictys, pp. viii-x; Dunger, 1878, op. cit., pp. 7 ff.; Wagner, 1880, Jahns' Jahrbuch. CXXXVI 509 ff.; and Greif, 1885, Die mittelalterl. Bearb. der Trojasage, p. 4 and, 1886, the continuation of the same in Stengel's Ausgabe u. Abhandlungen LXI 245 ff.

[5] Who compares (Quaest. Sallust., pp. 10 and 22) the Sallustian phrases ita inter artis bonas integrum ingenium brevi adolevit (Jug. 64, 5) and tam acceptum popularibus (Jug. 7, 1).

ample of the mannered phraseology of Sallust, is, at the same time, as we have seen, nothing more nor less than a free translation of the Greek, ἦν γὰρ ἔτι νέος καὶ γενναῖος καὶ [ὡραῖος]. It is, accordingly, evident that Septimius uses these borrowed phrases merely as a means of elaborating his original and that it is this method of amplification by imitation to which the words "uti erant Latine disserere" unquestionably refer.

Finally, the vindication afforded by the Greek fragment of Septimius' assertions with regard to the fact and manner of his translation predisposes us to accept as likewise true his final assertion, at the end of the epistle, to the effect that he has, in his translation, retained the first five books of his original intact, but has condensed the last five, which treat of the Return of the Greeks, into one (Meister, p. 1, ll. 18–20). Now, unfortunately, the truth of this last assertion cannot be tested by reference to the Greek fragment, which ends before the opening of the Νόστοι. But since the account of the Return of the Greeks is actually found to occupy the sixth book of the Latin text and since the version there given of this event is, as compared with the Byzantine versions, brief and full of evident omissions,[1] we may safely conclude that here again Septimius' assertion is to be taken at its face value and that the sixth and last book of the Latin text represents, as he declares, an epitome of the last five books of the Greek original.

I pass now to the earliest of the Byzantine versions, that by Joannes Malalas. The Greek fragment proves, in the first place, that the sixth century Malalas did not, as the advocates of a Latin Dictys have contended, derive his version of Dictys from the Latin of the fourth century Septimius.[2] For, to use a passage already familiar, it is manifestly impossible to regard Malalas' description of Troilus, ἦν γὰρ ἔτι νέος καὶ γενναῖος καὶ ὡραῖος (Mal. 130, 5) as a translation of the amplified Latin, recordati aetatem . . . . adolescebat when Malalas' words are precisely identical with those of the Greek fragment (cf. p. 331). On the contrary, it becomes at once clear that Malalas must have derived his version of Dictys either directly or indirectly from the Greek original.

[1] Cf. my Dares and Dictys, pp. 111 ff.

[2] Cf. Joly, 1870, op. cit., I 193 ff.; Dunger, 1878, op. cit., pp. 12 ff.; Haupt, 1881, Dares, Malalas, u. Sisyphus, Philologus XL 107 ff.; Greif, 1886, op. cit., pp. 173 ff.

The Greek fragment shows, in the second place, that the immediate source of Malalas was not, in all probability, the Greek original, but, as already maintained by Noack and myself,[1] an intermediary redaction, and this for the following reasons. Malalas' version of Dictys possesses two marked features absent in Septimius and in the later Byzantine versions. The two features thus peculiar to Malalas are (1) three distinct references to a certain Sisyphus of Cos as authority for events which in all other versions of Dictys are related as a regular portion of the Dictys recital[2] and (2) two curiously contrived dialogues wherein Malalas relates in dramatic style (first person) the very same war narrative which in all other versions of Dictys is related in straightforward narrative style (third person).[3] Now since these three Sisyphus citations and these two dialogues occur only in Malalas and since, furthermore, the third citation introduces Sisyphus as authority for the contents of the second dialogue,[4] it is obviously natural to associate this second dialogue[5] with Sisyphus and to regard the three Sisyphus citations and the second dialogue

[1] Noack, op. cit., pp. 439 ff.; Griffin, op. cit., pp. 77 ff.

[2] The events for which Sisyphus is cited as authority by Malalas are, first (Mal. 117, 1; Ekl. 209, 30), the adventures of Ulysses with the Cyclops (Mal. 114,18–116,23; Ekl. 208,16–209,31), related, without reference to Sisyphus, by Septimius (Eph. VI 5) and Cedrenus (232,17–21); secondly (Mal. 119,22; Ekl. 212,7), the adventures of Ulysses with Circe (Mal. 117,17–119,22; Ekl. 210,15–212,16), again related without reference to Sisyphus by Septimius (Eph. VI 6), John of Antioch (Salm. fr. 24, 10) and Cedrenus (232,21–23); and, thirdly (Mal. 132,19; Ekl. 221,16), the contents of the dialogue between Teucer and Pyrrhus (Mal. 122,17–132,16; Ekl. 216, 19–221,24), related in narrative form and still without reference to Sisyphus by Septimius (Eph. III 1–IV13), John of Antioch (Sik. 7,18–9,5), and Cedrenus (223,14–228,16).

[3] The contents of the first of these two dialogues (Mal. 109,16–114,1; Ekl. 205,8–207,30), which takes place between Ulysses and Ajax Telamon, is related in narrative style by Septimius (Eph. IV 20–21; V 7–13), John of Antioch (Sik. 9,9–10,25) and Cedrenus (228,16–232,2); of the second (Mal 122,17–132,16; Ekl. 216,19–221,24), in which Teucer and Pyrrhus are the participants, by Septimius (Eph. III 1–IV13), John of Antioch (Sik. 7, 18–9,5), and Cedrenus (223,14–228,16).

[4] Cf. note 1.

[5] Presumably not, however, the first dialogue, which not only stands under no Sisyphus citation, but is already present in embryo in the Dictaean debate between Ajax Telamon and Ulysses as to who shall possess the Palladium in Septimius (Eph. V 14), John of Antioch (Sik. 10,16–17), and Cedrenus (232,3–8).

as constituting evidence of the remains in Malalas of a second Trojan chronicle, distinct from the Dictys chronicle, which we may term the Sisyphus chronicle.   Save for these two Sisyphus elements Malalas derived his Troica solely from Dictys whom he cites repeatedly.[1] The question accordingly arises whence did Malalas obtain this peculiar Sisyphus matter which stands in such striking contrast to the Dictys matter in which it is embedded.   Now it is hardly to be supposed that Malalas, who, as the author of a world chronicle, was not, of course, primarily concerned with the story of Troy, would have taken the pains to consult two separate chronicles for materials which constitute so small a portion of his entire work.[2]   It is much more probable, on the contrary, that he found both his Dictys and his Sisyphus materials already combined in one and the same source.   But this source could not have been the Greek Dictys.   For the newly discovered fragment, which happens, fortunately, to open with those two events which form the conclusion of Malalas' second dialogue: viz., the deaths of Troilus and of Achilles (Tebtunis Papyri, p. 12, l. 1—p. 14, l. 53; Mal. 129,19–132,4; Ekl. 220,3–221,14), relates these events, not in the dramatic form used by Malalas, but, as we should expect, in the same straightforward narrative style used in all other versions of Dictys.   Hence it appears in all respects probable that Malalas derived his Troica from a redaction of Dictys in which the narrative form of the original recital had already become in part displaced by the dramatic form of the Sisyphus recital.

But little additional light is shed by the Greek fragment upon the version of Dictys by John of Antioch, and none whatsoever upon that by Cedrenus.   In one instance the fragment appears to confirm the view[3] that Antioch derived his version of Dictys neither from Septimius,[4] nor from Malalas,[5] nor from the two combined,[6]

[1] Eight times (Mal. 107,1 ; Ekl. 201,28 ; Mal. 119,23, Ekl. 212,7 ; Mal. 122,2, Ekl. 213,11 ; Ekl. 216,5; Mal. 132,22, Ekl. 221,19; Mal. 135,12; Mal. 250,2).

[2] Malalas' Troica occupy only a portion of one of the seventeen books into which the Χρονογραφία is divided (cf. p. 330, note 1).

[3] Held by Noack, 1892, op. cit., pp. 482 ff. ; Gleye, 1896, Byz. Zs. V 451 ff. ; and Griffin, op. cit., pp. 86 ff.

[4] Because he shares with Malalas certain particulars absent in Septimius (cf. Griffin, pp. 83–4).

[5] Because he shares with Septimius other particulars not found in Malalas (cf. Griffin, pp. 84–5).

[6] For he exhibits a third set of particulars found in neither one of his predecessors (Griffin, pp. 86–9).

but from the original Dictys.[1] For the occurrence of the word
νεκρούς (Tebtunis Papyri 13, 17) in a deleted portion of the
fragment renders it altogether probable that Antioch's corres-
ponding statement (Sik. 8, 21), absent alike in Septimius and
Malalas, that the Trojans desired to burn their dead (νεκρούς)
stood in the Greek Dictys.[2]

As regards, finally, the bearing of the Greek fragment upon
the relation between the prologue and the epistle of the Latin
Ephemeris, it is probable that the prologue, which relates in detail
the story of the discovery and subsequent preservation of the
annals of the Cretan soldier Dictys (Meister, pp. 2–3) was in-
vented by the unknown author of the Greek Dictys to serve as
preface to that text and that the brief recapitulation of that story
in the epistle (Meister, p. 1, ll. 1–14) was afterwards added by
Septimius as a translator's preface. As to the date of composi-
tion of the Greek text, occasional variations in the fragment from
what we must suppose to have been the original form of Dictys'
memoirs[3] serve to corroborate the generally accepted view that
the Dictys fiction was composed soon after the reign of Nero.[4]
For these variations might readily have appeared within the
considerable interval which would then have elapsed between the
original date of composition and the early third century, to which,
on the basis of the papyrus, which is dated 206, the fragment is
assigned by the editors (p. 10).

<div align="right">NATHANIEL E. GRIFFIN.</div>

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

[1] Cf. Griffin, pp. 86 ff.

[2] As conjectured by the editors (p. 16), without consulting John of Antioch.

[3] That the statement, for example, that Deiphobus, as well as Paris (T. P.
12, 5), led the Trojans to battle must have stood in the original Greek is
evident from the concurrence of Malalas (Mal. 129, 21 ; Ekl. 220, 5), Cedrenus
(227, 5), and Septimius ("Alexander cum reliquis fratribus", p. 75, l. 29). The
passage is omitted in the Antioch excerpts.

[4] Cf. Gudeman, op. cit., p. 152 ; Tebtunis Papyri, p. 10.

VII.—CONTRACTION IN THE CASE FORMS OF *DEUS* AND *MEUS, IS* AND *IDEM.* A STUDY OF CONTRACTION IN LATIN *IO-* AND *EO-, IĀ-* AND *EĀ-* STEMS.

The primary object of the present paper is to discuss the well-known contract forms which are found in the nominative-vocative plural and in the dative-ablative plural of *deus*, in the vocative plural masculine and in the dative-ablative plural of *meus*, and in the nominative plural masculine and the dative-ablative plural of the pronouns *is* and *ĭdem.* In order to form a correct judgment, however, upon the special problem proposed, it will be necessary also to consider briefly the general history of the *io-* and *eo-*, the *iā-* and *eā-* stems in the several case-forms just named.

In the time of Plautus and Terence the original diphthongs *oi̯* and *ai̯* of the nominative-vocative and dative-ablative plural had developed into a sound intermediate between *ē* and *ĭ* which is commonly written *ei*, less frequently *e*, in early Latin inscriptions, and which is usually denoted in modern discussions by the symbol *ẹ̄*. It was not until later—about 150 B. C.—that this close *ẹ̄* finally became *ĭ*. With respect to most *io-* and *iā-* stems, it is now generally admitted that the early dramatists have only the full forms of the nominative-vocative and dative-ablative plural; e. g., only *filii* (*filiei*), *filiis* (*filieis*), *gaudiis*, *gratiis*, *ingratiis*, and that the contract forms like *gratis*, *ingratis*, *fili*, *filis* belong either to the later republic (after 150 B. C.), or to the imperial period. Also in the case of most *eo-* and *eā-* stems, the early dramatists have only the full forms in use; e. g., *aurei* (*aureei*), *aureis* (*aureeis*), *ferrei*, *ferreis*, *balineis* and the like, and we find in fact no evidence of any contraction occurring in these stems at any period.[1]

In a small circle, however, of *eo-* and *eā-* stems; viz., in *eo-, eā-, meo-, meā-, deo-*, we find that the contract forms were already fully

[1] Of course we find these case-forms treated at times with synizesis in the poets; e. g., Verg., Aen. X 496, *baltḗ͡a*; ib. V 352, VIII 553, *aurḗ͡as*; Sil. XIV 229, *alvḗ͡a*.

established in use in the period of the early dramatists. This is very strikingly the case with *di*, *dis*, which are the sole forms known to early Latin and to the early Latin poets, while the reformations *děi*, *děis* are products of the literary language and are first found in the period of Catullus. It is highly probable also that the genuine monosyllabic forms *ī* and *īs*, *īdem* and *īsdem* were freely in use in the time of Plautus and Terence, except in the case of the anapaestic word-groups like *sěd-ěī*, *ab-eīs*, *in-eisdem*.[1] From the year 120 B. C. on the existence of these monosyllabic forms is certainly and abundantly attested by inscriptions, but, as has just been stated, there is good reason to believe that they had come into general use at a still earlier date. It is certain also that the vocative plural masculine *mi* occurs already in Plautus as an absolute monosyllable (Ci. 678; Mi. 1330; cf. Classical Philology III 162). With respect, however, to the early forms of the nominative plural masculine and the dative-ablative plural of *meus* we cannot speak with the same certainty. The full dissyllabic forms *měī*, *měīs* are of course rare in Plautus, but we are unable to state positively whether the usual dimoric forms *meī̂*, *meī̂s* are absolute monosyllables; i. e., *mī*, *mīs*, or whether, like *meôs*, *deôs*, they are only synizesis or quasimonosyllabic forms which owe their dimoric value to the play of the sentence-accent (Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc. XXXVI 179). The spellings *mis* and *mieis* preserved in the Plautus MSS[2] and the spelling *mieis* in inscriptions[3] forcibly suggest, however, that the dative-ablative plural at least is sometimes an absolute monosyllable in Plautus, and this conclusion is further confirmed by the partly analogical formations *sis* (Enn., Lucr.) and *tis* (Inscr. Or. 4847),[4] and perhaps also by the occurrence of *meī̂s* in the dialogue verse of Seneca (Troad. 191).

We have then the task of accounting for the foregoing facts and explaining the early forms *dī*, *dīs*, *mī* (vocative plural), *mīs*, *ī*, *īs*, *īdem*, *īsdem* and perhaps *mī* (nominative plural). Several theories upon the origin of these forms have been suggested, but

---

[1] See Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc. XXXVI (1905), p. 206 f. and n. 1 ; Sturtevant, Contraction in Case Forms, etc., pp. 26, 34.

[2] *Mieis* (monosyllabic) Men. 203 (BC), *mis* Tri. 822 (BC); cf. *mi is* Ps. 764 and 779 (B)'; see Neue II³ 366. Sturtevant, l. l., pp. 8, 11, shows clearly that the combination *iei* sometimes represents in Latin inscriptions the sound *ī*.

[3] E. g., CIL. I 38 ; cf. Sturtevant, l. l., pp. 35, 8, 11 ff.

[4] For the relation of *sīs* to *dīs*, *īs*, *mīs*, cf. Trans., p. 205.

23

only two seem of sufficient importance to be mentioned here. Thurneysen, Kuhn's Zeitschrift XXX (1890), p. 500, has assumed, upon the basis of certain Old Latin forms,[1] that *ĕ* became *ī* before *ei* and that contraction then took place. The obvious objection to this view, in the form in which Thurneysen has stated it, is that the sound group *iẹ*, in ordinary *io-* and *iā-* stems, does not contract in the time of Plautus, but is fully preserved in *filiei*, *filieis*, *gratieis*, and the like until about the year 150 B. C. It may be added further that the reduction of the earlier *gratiis* to *gratīs*, as of the earlier *larua* (trisyllable) to *larva*, shows the operation of a species of post-tonic syncope (Lindsay, Lat. Lang., pp. 46, 184), while the shortening of *eis* to *īs*, in a phrase like *(e)īs ánnis*, is rather to be ascribed to the effects of pretonic syncope.

A second theory has been put forward by Sturtevant, who has discussed the history and use of these contract form with scrupulous care and thoroughness in a valuable monograph entitled, " Contraction in the Case Forms of the Latin *i̯o-* and *i̯ā-* Stems, and of *deus, is* and *idem* ", Chicago, 1902.[2] After rejecting the view of Thurneysen mentioned above, Sturtevant himself assumes (p. 33 f.) that the sound group *eẹ* 'naturally' contracted into *ẹ̄*, and the original forms *deẹ, *deẹs, meẹ* thus gave rise to *dẹ̄, dẹ̄s, mẹ̄* (later *dī, dīs, mī*). This last theory unfortunately, in the form in which it is stated by Sturtevant, admits of precisely the same kind of refutation as the explanation of Thurneysen. For the group *eẹ*, as has already been stated (p. 336), does not ordinarily contract in Old Latin, and, in a well-known group of words in frequent use, Plautus has only the full forms *aureei* (*aureẹ̄*), *aureeis* (*aureẹ̄s*), *argenteeis, ferreei, ferreeis, balineeis, araneeis, consanguineeis*, etc. (I mention only forms which actually occur in Plautus.)

---

[1] Namely, *iei, ieis, miis* (ascribed to Terence by Velius Longus, p. 77 Keil), *abiegnieis* and *aesculnieis* (CIL. I 577), also the nominative feminine *mia*, a form which is presupposed by several of the Romance languages.

[2] Cf. also the convenient summary of this study which is published in Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc. XXXII (1901), cxxxi ff. Sturtevant's dissertation is reviewed briefly by Max Niedermann, Berlin. Phil. Wochenschr. XXIII (1903), p. 888, who commends the painstaking method and statistics of the work, but adds significantly: "Dagegen scheint der Verf. bei der wissenschaftlichen Verarbeitung seiner Sammlungen daraus nicht den Gewinn gezogen zu haben, der sich tatsächlich daraus ziehen lässt, so dass in Zukunft vielfach andere da ernten werden, wo er gesät hat". A summary of the study is also given by Stolz, Zeitschr. f. d. Oesterreich. Gymnas. LIV (1903), p. 503.

It is evident from the foregoing statement that in ordinary cases both the sound group *iĕ* (later *ii*) remained uncontracted in the time of Plautus and the closely allied sound group *eĕ* (later *ei*) continued unchanged throughout historical Latin. It follows, therefore, that the contraction of these groups in the stems *eo-*, *meo-*, *deo-* is exceptional and is connected with some additional factor as an assisting cause. In other words, the vowels *e* or *i* and *ĕ*, although near together in quality, are not absolutely similar; consequently they will not readily merge into a single sound, unless an additional momentum be brought into play. What the additional momentum is, must be clear, as I think, to every student of the Old Latin synizesis phenomena. The law of these phenomena, as I have sought to state it elsewhere (Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc. XXXVI 173 ff.; Classical Philology III 154 ff.) is the following: An *initial* iambic sequence containing the semivowels *i* (*e*) and *u* in hiatus tends within the sentence towards a mono-syllabic pronunciation (e. g. *meŏs*, *eĭs*, *eĭsdem*), but does not actually assume this value. At the close of the sentence, how-ever, the schwa-vowel is still distinctly heard (e. g. *mĕŏs*, *ĕĭs*).

It is the concurrence then of two causes which produces absolute monosyllabic forms, viz.: (1) the tendency toward a slurred pronunciation of every *initial* iambic sequence which involves hiatus; e. g., *deŏs*, *deŏ*, *deĭ*, and, in extreme cases, towards the consonantization and ultimate loss of the semi-vowel; e. g., *d(y)ĭ*, *d(y)ĭs*, *m(y)ĭ*, *m(y)ĭs*,[1] (2) the tendency toward the contraction of vowels which are nearly related in quality.[2] In other words, contraction may take place as a further development of synizesis in those cases where the vowels which

[1] Cf. the vulgar forms *do*, *dae* (Schuchardt Vok. II, 463; III, 298), which show a similar loss of the semivowel, and also the frequent inscriptional forms of late Latin, viz. *des* (for *dies*), *zes*, *de*, *debus*, *dis*, *dibus* (Schuchardt II, 445; III, 295; I, 67 ff.; II, 513 f.; III, 310; Seelmann, Ausspr. d. Lat. 239, 321 ff.); cf. also Oscan *zicolom* for **dieculom* (Buck, Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian § 134, a). It should be remembered that synizesis is a broad term and the synizesis process is an elastic one. Old Latin synizesis was un-doubtedly in the main 'the running together of two vowels without full con-traction' (Trans., p. 170 ff.), but again it was sometimes complete diphthong-alization (cf. *eĭ*, dative singular), and sometimes complete consonantization (e. g. *dvellum, jo*).

[2] In Umbr. the close *ē* resulting from *oi* in final syllables was so near in quality to *i* as to actually contract with it in the Dat. Sg. and the Dat.-Abl. Pl of stems in *ĭo-*; thus we have Dat.-Abl. Pl. *Atiersir* beside *Atiersier*.

occur in hiatus are closely related in quality, or the shortened form may even in some cases arise as the result of consonantization; e. g., *d[y]ĭ, d[y]ō, d[y]ĕs.* In the time of Plautus, however, these processes were limited to those cases of *eĕ* or *iĕ* which occurred in an initial iambic sequence. In addition, since synizesis occurs most freely in well-worn and familiar proclitic word (Trans., pp. 184 ff., 210; Classical Philology III 157, 164), it follows that contraction also is especially natural in the pronominal forms *ĭ, ĭs, ĭdem, ĭsdem, mĭ, mĭs.*

The contract forms *di, dis* call for some further notice;[1] for it is evident that the contraction which has taken place in these cases is not only more complete and more thoroughgoing than that which is admissible, for example, in *reis* (from *reus*) and in *viis* and *piis* (from *via* and *pius*),[2] but even more rigorously carried out than the reduction which appears in the case-forms of the pronouns. As I have briefly suggested elsewhere (Trans., p. 181, n. 1), the tendency towards monosyllabic pronunciation which affects so strongly all the iambic forms of *deus* (e. g. *deos, deum, deo*), seems largely due to an extremely frequent and trite use of the word in oaths, adjurations and prayers, and hence may be fitly compared with the reduction which is seen in English oaths like *odd's death, 's death, zounds, pardi, pardy, perdy* (Old Fr. *pardie, pardé*; Fr. *pardi, pardieu*),[3] as well as with the quick exclamatory utterance of such English phrases as ' *God forbid*', ' *God be praised*', ' *I thank God*'.

I am disposed to conjecture further that the exclusive monosyllabic form has arisen first in the exclamatory vocative *di*, and then been extended by analogy to the nominative and the dative-ablative plural. It is true that the nominative plural is the more frequent form, occurring three times as often in Plautus as the vocative plural, yet the latter is also extremely trite and familiar.[4]

[1] The derivation from *divi, divis* which is sometimes doubtfully proposed (e. g. Lindsay, Capt., p. 27), might perhaps explain the forms *di, dis*, but scarcely accounts satisfactorily for the *absence* of the forms *dei, deis*.

[2] The nominative plural masculine of an adjective like *pius* or *meus* is also preserved from thoroughgoing contraction by the influence of the dissyllabic feminine and neuter forms; e. g., (*mei*), *meae, mea*.

[3] Cf. also the proper name *Parsall* (*Par ciel*), and Fr. *morbleu, parbleu, palsambleu*, and the like.

[4] According to Lodge, Lex. Plaut., the nominative plural occurs two hundred and thirty-one times in Plautus, the vocative plural seventy-five times.

It is also highly emotional and exclamatory in its use, and may be compared in this respect with such monosyllabic ejaculations as the English 'Fire!', 'Help!', 'Stop!', and similar expressions. Hence the physiological difficulty of uttering two nearly similar vowels in hiatus may well have reached its maximum in this form, as well as in the vocative plural *mi* (p. 337),[1] and the conditions which are most favorable to thoroughgoing contraction were thus presented in both cases. We may note in this connection familiar exclamations like *di, vostram fidem* (Cap. 418, Ci. 259, etc.), and illustrate the general use of the vocative by Mer. 850 date, *di*, quaeso; Ru. 1298 *di*, quaeso, subvenite, etc. Having once arisen in the vocative plural, we may conjecture that the contract form would quickly be extended to the nominative plural and to the dative-ablative plural, especially as the latter forms often receive the same emphatic and emotional utterance in prayers, imprecations and expressions of joy and thanksgiving. These familiar uses may be sufficiently illustrated by the following: As. 46 di tibi dent quaequomque optes; St. 469 di dent quae velis; Tri. 992 di te perdant, si te flocci facio; Poe. 1254 dis est aequom gratias nos agere; Ci. 624 dis hercle habeo gratiam.

To sum up the conclusions of this discussion: In the case of vowels in hiatus closely related in quantity (*eẹ* and *iẹ*), contraction took place as a further development of synizesis in those trite and well-worn pronominal forms like *ẹ, ẹs, ẹdem* and *mē*, which originally showed the initial iambic sequence. Under similar conditions a still more complete reduction occurred in the forms *dẹ, dẹs*, which are not only trite and familiar, but inclined by their very meaning to emotional and exclamatory utterance.[2]

ROBERT S. RADFORD.

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE.

[1] Cf. also the unusual contraction of *ie* which is seen in vocative singular *mī* (from **mie*), and in vocatives like *fili, Corneli.*

[2] On a possible consonantization $d[y]\ẹ, d[y]\ẹs$ in some cases, see above, p. 339.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Evangelium secundum Johannem. The Gospel of Saint John in West-Saxon. Edited from the Manuscripts, with introduction, and Notes. By JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, PH. D., Professor of English Philology in the Johns Hopkins University, with a Glossary by LANCELOT MINOR HARRIS, PH. D., Professor of English in the College of Charleston. Boston, U. S. A., and London, D. C. Heath & Co., Publishers, 1904. Saint Matthew, 1904; Saint Mark, 1905; Saint Luke, 1906; all without Notes and Glossary.

This edition of the West-Saxon Gospels by Professor Bright, in Heath's Belles-Lettres Series, was completed two years ago as regards the text, but so far only the Gospel of St. John has been provided with Notes and Glossary. The plan of the edition is to give the text of the Corpus MS, in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, formerly belonging to Archbishop Parker, and to place at the foot of the page the variants from the other MSS, A, in the Cambridge University Library, B, in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and C, among the Cottonian MSS, in the British Museum.

The text of the recently discovered fragment of the Gospel of St. John—, called the Lakelands fragment, and containing from ii 6—iii 34, and from vi 19—vii 10—, is given after the Introduction to that Gospel. It was discovered by Professor Napier in a volume purchased by the Curators of the Bodleian Library, March 14, 1891, and first published by him in Herrig's Archiv, lxxxvii, 255–261. It is contemporary with the other MSS of this version and is related to MS A. The Introduction to St. John's Gospel contains brief sections on vernacular Scripture in Anglo-Saxon times, Bede's translation of the Gospel of St. John, the Manuscripts of the West-Saxon Gospels, the relation of the Manuscripts to the Original, the authorship of the Version and the Latin Original of the Version. This Version of the West-Saxon Gospels, for all these manuscripts are of the same Version, was made from the Vulgate, not as Bosworth thought (followed by Corson) from the Old Latin previous to Jerome. Bosworth was misled by certain variations in MSS of the Vulgate, due most probably to the Irish type of text, for the Anglo-Saxon

(or British) type is mixed, "being fundamentally Roman, but pervaded by Irish readings". "The original of St. John", thinks Professor Harris, "was least affected by the influence of the Irish type and 'was almost Hieronymian.'"

A useful Bibliography of some half-dozen pages is inserted between the Notes and the Glossary. A note to the title of Thorpe's edition of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels states that "This edition was reprinted in America by Louis F. Klipstein: New York, George P. Putnam, 1848". My copy of Klipstein's reprint of Thorpe is dated, "Wiley and Putnam, 1846", evidently an earlier edition and believed to be the first printed by Putnam. It is a great advantage to have such a handy and inexpensive edition of the separate Anglo-Saxon Gospels, and both editor and publishers are to be congratulated on this, doubtless successful, issue.

The only improvement that we can suggest is the enlargement of the Glossary appended to St. John's Gospel so as to include the words of the other Gospels not found in this Glossary. A supplement might suffice, but it would be better to include the words of all the Gospels under one alphabet. A cursory review of St. Matthew shows the following words not used by St. John: iv 3, *costniend*; v 26, *feorðling*; v 33, *āgyllst*; vi 21, *goldhord*; ix 25, *geēode*; x 3, *publicanus*; x 10, *wyrhta*; x 15, *ācumenlīcre*; xi 22, *forgifenlīcor*; xiii 22, *geornfullnes*; xv 13, *āwyrtwalod*; xx, passage of ten lines between 28 and 29;[1] xxi 28, 29, *wīngearde* is printed *wingearde* in 29; xxi 32, *myltystran*; xxi 33, *wingeard* and *elþēodignysse*; xxii 5, *mangunge*; xxii 12, *gesuwode*; xxii 19, *aetȳwaõ*; xxiii 5, *tōbrǣdaþ, healsbēc, maersiaõ, fnadū*; xxiii 13, *ȟccetteras*; xxiv 27, *ēastdǣle, westdǣl*; 28, *earnas*; 43, *geþafigan, underdulfe*; xxv 14, *elþēodignesse*; 18, *bedëalf* [*bedealf*]; 39 *untrumne*; 41, *wynstran*; xxvi 30, *gesungene*; 36 *Gezemani*; 69, *þēowyn*; 71, *wȳln*; xxvii 7, 8, *æcyr*; 7, *tigylwyrhtena, elþēodisce*; 34, *geallan*.

A few others have been observed in glancing through the volumes, but this list makes no pretensions to completeness: Mark vii 22, [*stala*], *dysignessa*; xiii 17, *cennendum*, 34 *elþēodiglīce*; Luke xxiv 11, *wōffung*; this last word is given *woffung* by Clark Hall, Sweet, and Toller; so we must consider *wōffung* as an oversight; it is hard to avoid oversights in a multitude of minutiae. Note also in the Introduction to St. John's Gospel, p. xxiii 4, *hwar* for *hwār*.

Professor Bright has laid great stress upon the insertion of all variants at the foot of the page. As the present reviewer has no access to manuscripts, the only test available is the comparison

[1] Professor Skeat tells us (Preface to St. Matthew's Gospel, p. 10) that "This interpolation is found in some of the Vulgate versions, the most remarkable being the celebrated Graeco-Latin Codex D, commonly called the Codex Bezae, in the Cambridge University Library. It also occurs in the Corbey Codex (Codex Corbeiensis), and (with some variations) in the Codex Veronensis."

with Professor Skeat's edition, who also prints from the Corpus MS and inserts the variants from A and B at foot of the first column.

In Matthew, chapter iv, verse 15 is omitted without remark. Professor Skeat states that "Ver. 15 is omitted in all the copies", even in the later MSS Hatton and Royal, so the omission of the translator or scribe was never supplied. The verse, however, occurs in the Lindisfarne and Rushworth MSS, an incidental proof of the independence of these translators.

As Thorpe's edition of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, even in the Klipstein reprint, has been long out of print, and Skeat's edition is too expensive for school and college use, besides not being convenient for that purpose, Professor Bright's edition comes in most suitably, and will, doubtless, be extensively used. A complete Glossary to the four volumes is a desideratum, and will eventually be prepared along with requisite notes to the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. Luke.

Beowulf, An Old English Epic (The Earliest Epic of the Germanic Race). Translated into Modern English Prose by WENTWORTH HUYSHE, with Notes and Illustrations. London, George Routledge & Sons, Ltd.; New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., liii, 216 [1907].

The interest in the translation of Beowulf still continues. During the past few years there have been other translations into German besides those of Grein and Heyne, well-known to scholars, and since that of Clark Hall (1901), noticed by the writer in his paper on "Recent Translations of Old English Poetry" (Publications of the Mod. Lang. Assoc., XVIII 3, 1903), we have had those of Tinker (1902),—also noticed in the above-mentioned paper,—of Child (1904), and now a new and elaborate one, without date, but issued in 1907, by Mr. Wentworth Huyshe. I must condemn in passing the practice of some publishers of omitting from the title-page the date of publication, an unfortunate recent practice, which would be "more honoured in the breach than the observance". If there is one thing that a reader wants especially to know, it is *when* a book was published. Mr. Huyshe's translation contains a full Introduction of over fifty pages, giving an account of the manuscript, argument, origin and date of the poem, its literary quality, scenes and surroundings, and social life,—in which both Mr. Clark Hall and Professor Harrison are drawn upon.

The translation is divided into four parts: the fight with the demon Grendel, the fight with Grendel's mother, Beowulf's return to Gothland, and Beowulf and the Dragon, with subheadings under each, and, as an appendix, the Fight at Finn's Burgh. Each section is followed by notes elucidating the poem;

the episodes are printed in smaller type, as in Mr. Clark Hall's translation, upon which the present translator seems to be somewhat dependent. There are also in many expressions coincidences between this translation and one of twenty-five years ago published by the present writer, showing that it has, at least, been read by the translator, but the result will be to make "Beowulf" better known, which is the main point. One point in which Mr. Huyshe has imitated Mr. Clark Hall, and even surpassed him, is in the numerous illustrations which add value to the translation, as the vessel, the hall, the armor, and the horse-trappings are abundantly illustrated, but it is not always stated from what work the illustrations are taken. A map, similar to the one in Mr. Clark Hall's translation, though not so neatly drawn, is prefixed to p. 11, but we miss the genealogies and the index of proper names, both of which should have been added. Facsimiles of the same pages of the manuscript as in Mr. Clark Hall's translation are given, but in both occur the same misprint, 2177 for 2127 These pages are reduced from Professor Zupitza's edition of the manuscript for the Early English Text Society, published in 1882. A few other misprints in the Introduction may be noted for future correction: p. xxxiii, line 3, 579; line 14 from bottom, Pendas'; p. xxxiv, lines 2 and 24, Scôp; p. xxxviii, line 8 from bottom, Chanci; p. xliv, line 3 from bottom, edintification; p. xlviii, line 19, *Volsunga*. And there are some others in the book, but misprints are hard to avoid. Mr. Huyshe tells us (Notes, p. 43) that "The lines are those according to the text of Mr. A. J. Wyatt", so presumably the translation is made from that text, which seems to be increasing in favor. No one of the younger scholars has yet adopted my suggestion of a few years ago that some one of them should give us a variorum edition of the text, which would supply a more secure basis for translation. A marginal numbering of the lines, as adopted by Mr. Clark Hall, would make the translation much more convenient for reference. While I should not follow Mr. Huyshe in all of his renderings, I may say that I think the translation quite well done, and that it will prove helpful to the student. It is strange, however, that in two passages of the Notes, pp. 188 and 190, he should call Ecgtheow Beowulf's *mother*. This is contrary to the views of all other commentators and translators, as far as I know, and is entirely original. It cannot be charged to a *misprint*, and is evidently a *lapsus memoriae*; however, it can be easily corrected, a good translation thereby bettered, and the knowledge of "Beowulf" thereby extended. The translation of the Fight at Finn's Burgh, also made from Mr. Wyatt's text, has some readings which need correction: p. 203, line 4, *byrnad* should be *byrnad*; line 12 from bottom, for "he" read "they"; p. 204, line 1, the lacuna might have been translated according to Wyatt's text, but Mr. Huyshe says that he has "not attempted a reading or a translation". Hickes's text is corrupt, but Grein has, perhaps, made the best

restorations of this obscure text.   In the section on "editions and translations", after the name of Professor J. Leslie Hall, *dele* "late", as he is still with us; add the name of Mr. C. G. Child, (prose), 1904; and p. 216, correct the misprint in Ettmüller's name, and prefix "N." to that of Grundtvig.

———

Tragedy. By ASHLEY H. THORNDIKE, Professor of English in Columbia University. Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1908.

This is the most recent volume in "The Types of English Literature" series, and, in the words of the author, "This book attempts to trace the course of English tragedy from its beginnings to the middle of the nineteenth century, and to indicate the part which it has played in the history both of the theatre and of literature."   This is a commendable and a desirable object, but it is a question whether it is possible to accomplish it in less than four hundred 12mo pages.   Fortunately the Elizabethan Drama (1558–1642), with an Introduction on the earlier period, has just been treated by Professor Schelling in two 8vo volumes of over 600 pages each, and Professor Thorndike would do well to continue that work on the same scale "to the middle of the nineteenth century".   Besides the necessarily scanty treatment that must be given to so comprehensive a subject in such limited space, it is also a question whether the method adopted in "The Types of English Literature" series is the best.   The result is apt to be a volume, or volumes, of condensed annals, with brief critical comments, which may suit well enough those who know the subject already, and therefore do not need this kind of information, but such a treatment will scarcely give the requisite information to those who are ignorant of the subject.

A brief summary of the plot of a tragedy will hardly answer as a basis for an appreciation of the critical comments, or enable the student to dispense with the reading of the play itself.

The trouble with all such compendiums is that they assume knowledge which the reader does not possess, and therefore he cannot enter into the spirit of the writer, and judge of the latter's criticism, however just it may be.   Barring the objection taken to the method, and the resulting treatment of the subject, both being defects consequent upon the plan of these works, Professor Thorndike has done as well as could be expected under the circumstances.

If he has mastered a tithe of the works enumerated in the bibliographical notes attached to the chapters, he has equipped himself well for the treatment of his subject, and has provided the material from which his readers may select what suits their respective objects.

I should have liked to see some discussion of the vehicle of tragedy, prose, rhymed couplet and blank verse, and an effort to answer the question why blank verse has been settled upon as the only suitable form for tragedy. Writers on the subject have given too little attention to the form of verse that tragedies have assumed, but the English iambic pentameter unrhymed seems the natural successor of the Greek iambic trimeter for the purposes of tragedy.

Another question that suggests itself is, why has the novel usurped the place of the tragic drama? That the stage has degenerated in our day goes without saying. What is the cause of this degeneracy? I do not lay much stress on Professor Thorndike's biological or physical analogies, and I think it useless to try to trace analogies between the moral and the physical sciences. I heartily endorse his remark (p. 377): "Tragedy takes an abiding place among the great courses of continuous human activity dedicated to an inquiry into the meanings of life". Of course this means moral and spiritual, not physical, life; and here the ancient Greeks had the advantage of us. Compare the great Sophoclean dramas with the puny efforts of our modern tragicasters. It can not be that the world is degenerating, but our forms of amusement are. We should try to restore higher ideals of life. Let us bear in mind the apostolic motto : εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

1. The Cattle-Raid of Cooley (Tain Bo Cualnge), An Old Irish Prose-Epic, Translated by L. WINIFRED FARADAY. London, David Nutt, 1904, XXI + 141 pp., in 8°.

2. Die Altirische Heldensage Táin Bó Cúalnge, nach dem Buch von Leinster in Text und Uebersetzung. Herausgegeben von ERNST WINDISCH. Leipzig, S. Hirzel, 1905, XCII + 1120 pp., in 8°.

3. Táin Bó Cúalnge, Enlèvement [du Taureau divin et] des vaches de Cooley. Traduction par H. D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE. Première livraison. Paris, H. Champion, 1907, 83 pp., gr. in 8°.

In the above works we have at last complete and accurate translations of the greatest of the Old Irish hero-tales, the Tain Bo Cualnge, or the "Raid for the Kine of Cooley." For more than half a century this famous epic—for it is naught else than an epic in prose—has remained within easy reach in the Book of Leinster, the Yellow Book of Lecan, and numerous other MSS.

The scholarly O'Curry first called attention to it in 1861 in his excellent work entitled Lectures on the MS Materials,[1] where he gave a brief outline of the story. He had already published in 1858 in the first volume of the Atlantis, the Seirglige Conculain, or the Sick-bed of Cuchulainn, one of the numerous stories relating to the great epic. In the Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy[2] for 1879, another Irish scholar, O'Looney, indicated the various divisions and prefaces of the Tain, and announced that he had undertaken an edition of the same. Unfortunately the brilliant Irishman did not live to complete his work. In 1881 the distinguished French savant, M. d'Arbois de Jubainville, was sent by Jules Ferry, then Minister of Public Instruction, on a mission to the British Isles to investigate and catalogue all the Irish MSS to be found. As a result of this voyage we have the well-known Catalogue de la litt. épique de l'Irlande.[3] Among the numerous interesting things contained in this volume is a practically complete list of all the MSS of the Tain.[4] The learned Frenchman also called attention to the fact that the Book of Leinster mentioned 12 different tales, or *remscéla*, serving as introductions to this epic.[5] After a long interval during which many of the saga relating to the Tain were edited and translated,[6] there appeared in 1898 a volume entitled the Cuchulinn Saga, by Miss Eleanor Hull. Among other things this work contained a summary and part translation[7] of the great epic, by Standish Hayes O'Grady. It was not, however, until 1904 that any complete translation of the Tain was attempted—this time by Winifred Faraday, a pupil of the late Prof. Strachan, whose unexpected demise last year was a great blow to Celtic studies. In 1905 Windisch brought out his monumental edition of the celebrated epic; and at present the translation of d'Arbois is being issued from the press.

The date of the Tain remains yet a matter of conjecture. According to Tigernach, who died in 1088, the famous raid took place about eight years before the Christian Era.[8] The epic, however, is of a much later date. But the time of its composition will ever be difficult to ascertain, inasmuch as the Celts, like most

[1] Pp. 31–40. This work was reprinted in 1878. In his Manners and Customs, London, 1873, III, pp. 414–463, O'Curry gave the text and translation from the Book of Leinster of the Fight with Ferdia, one of the episodes of the Tain.

[2] II series, Vol. I, pp. 242–8.   [3] Paris, 1883, gr. in 8°.

[4] It is worth noting that of the fifteen MSS mentioned by d'Arbois only two antedate the 15th cent.; three are from the 15th and 16th cents., and ten from the 17th to the 19th cents. The author had omitted by oversight the Yellow Book of Lecan, which is from the 14th–15th cents.

[5] Miss Hull, in her work mentioned below, has increased this number to twenty-four.

[6] Cf. Windisch and Stokes, Irische Texte III, pp. 235, etc., where are published the text and translation of the Do chuphur in da muccado, or the "Begetting of the two swineherds", etc.

[7] Pp. 112–227.   [8] O'Connor, Rerum hibernicarum scriptores II, p. 14.

primitive peoples, did not confide their learning to writing. And especially in Ireland was this true. The corporation of the *fáithi* or *filid* (i. e. seers or prophets) laid particular stress on the memory in their system of education.[1] The literary apprentice- ship of the *filid* lasted from twelve to twenty years, during which they were obliged to memorize a long list of stories. Thus, the first year they learned at least twenty stories (in Irish, *drecht* or *scél*), the second year thirty, the third year forty, and so on until in six years they had memorized 270 in all. Then began studies in divination, geography, composition of poems, etc. Thus, doubtless, for centuries the numerous stories contained in the Tain were preserved only in the memories of the *filid*. The first written version supposed to have been made of this great epic was that of Senchan Torpeist, who, according to d'Arbois and Zimmer,[2] was an *ollam file* of the first half of the 7th century. The story relates that Senchan rediscovered the Tain in a miraculous way.[3] It is more probable, however, that this story was created merely to explain that Senchan's version of the epic was of such excellent quality that it completely silenced all com- peting versions.[4] For more than three centuries his was accepted as the only complete version of the Tain. In the 11th cent., however, by reason of the new accounts that had come into exist- ence, a new redaction was made, of which the Book of Leinster (ca. 1160) is the oldest representative. This version is much more literary and complete than that of the Leabhar na hUidhri, the " Book of the Dun Cow " (ca. 1100), whose archaic language and simple direct prose are indications of its great antiquity

[1] According to a gloss on the Senchus Mor (Ancient Laws of Ireland I, pp. 44–47) there were ten classes of *filid* ranked with regard to the number of saga they were able to relate. Thus, the highest in rank, the *ollam file*, knew 350 stories ; next came the *anruth* who had at his command 175 stories, etc., down to the *oblaire* who could relate but seven stories. With regard to the other classes of society, the *filid* ranked very high. The *ollam file*, or chief of the *filid*, ranked on a level with a noble of the second class ; or, in other words, he was placed at the table immediately after the *ollam brithem*, the chief speaker of the law, who ranked on a level with the noble of the first class. Compare in the Icelandic saga the somewhat similar relation between the *logsǫgomaðr*, or the speaker of the law, and the *sagamaðr*, or relater of the saga. For further information on the *filid*, cf. d'Arbois de Jubainville, Les Druides et les dieux celtiques, 1906, pp. 103, etc., as well as his Cours de Litt. celt., 1883. I, pp. 319, etc. ; Dottin, Manuel de l'antiquité celtique, 1906, pp. 267 ; and Thurneysen, Ir. Texte III, pp. 113, etc.

[2] Ueber den compilatorischen Charakter der irischen Sagentexte, etc., Zeitsch. für vgl. Sprachforschung XXVIII, pp. 426 ff., 1887.

[3] Cf. Finding of the Tain, translated by O. Connellan, Ossianic Society, Vol. V.

[4] On account of the numerous poems interspersed in the text, Dr. Sullivan was led to suggest that the Tain was originally written in verse, the prose- parts representing what had been entirely lost. This process, however, in the opinion of Dr. Hyde, would seem contrary to the history of the develop- ment of epic poetry. Cf. A Literary History of Ireland, by Douglas Hyde, New York, 1899, pp. 399, etc.

(being probably the version of Senchan).   The Yellow Book of
Lecan (14th–15th cents.) gives at times, in its incomplete version,
an older and better text than the Book of Dun Cow.

The story of the Tain is so long and complicated that only a
brief outline of its salient features can be given here.   The epic
begins with a dispute between Ailill and Medb, king and queen
of Connaught, as to which possesses the greater amount of prop-
erty.   After comparing their jewels and other treasures, they
come finally to their herds of cattle, the most precious possession
of the ancient Irishman.   Medb had possessed a very valuable
bull, *Findbennach* (White-horned), which, however, not wishing
to belong to a woman, had left her herd for that of Ailill.   With
this magnificent animal there was none to compare, save the
Dun Bull which was in Cooley, a district in Ulster.   These two
bulls were in reality the seventh forms of two rival swineherds of
the *Sid*, a fairy race that inhabited Ireland.   They had originally
possessed human form, the one being swineherd to Ochall Oichni,
king of the *Sid* of Connaught, the other to Bodb, king of the *Sid*
of Munster.   The result of the intense rivalry existing between
them was the neglect of their swine, which were allowed to
dwindle away and die.   Enraged at this, their kings removed
them from their offices and changed them into ravens.   Never-
theless, the struggle between the two rivals continued.   Every
two years they were obliged to change their forms until finally,
having become worms, they were drunk up by two bulls, the
one belonging to Medb and the other to Fiachna mac Dare of
Cooley.[1]

Accordingly Medb sends an embassy to Fiachna, requesting
the loan of the Dun Bull for one year, promising fifty heifers in
return.   The embassy fails and returns empty-handed to Con-
naught.   In order to punish the impudent chieftain, Medb resolves
to invade Ulster and to take forcible possession of the animal.[2]

The indignant queen begins her expedition at the opportune
moment when Conchobar, King of Ulster, and all his warriors are
afflicted by a periodical sickness.   The defense of the kingdom
of Ulster is left entirely to the boy Cuchulainn, nephew of Con-
chobar.   Under the protection of his divine father Lug,[3] this
heroic youth withstands singlehanded all the hosts of Medb.

[1] Cf. Windisch, loc. cit., and The Voyage of Bran by Alfred Nutt and Kuno
Meyer, London, 1897, Vol. II, pp. 58, etc.

[2] To carry off the bull, as M. d'Arbois observes, meant to drive off the herd
of which he was the chief.   For that reason the epic is entitled the raid of the
cattle instead of the raid of the bull.   Cattle-driving was one of the common
methods of warfare in Ireland up to very recent times.   Walter Scott relates in
Waverley (Ch. XV) a story of a similar expedition made by twelve Highlanders.

[3] Cuchulainn had both divine and human parents.   His resemblance to
Herakles has been pointed out by d'Arbois.   Miss Hull (op. cit.) and Alfred
Nutt (Cuchulainn, the Irish Achilles, London, 1900, pp. 42, etc.), have further
emphasized his traits as the solar hero.   That he was known to other Celtic
tribes besides the Irish has been shown by d'Arbois (Rev. celt. XIX, p. 245).

After a long series of combats with great loss of life, Medb finally secures possession of the Dun Bull which she drives away to Connaught. But hardly do the rival bulls behold one another than they begin to fight. In the end the Dun Bull is victorious, and escapes to Ulster with the remains of his enemy, Findbennach, on his horns. Immediately after his arrival, however, he utters one loud roar of triumph and, as Windisch translates, "*es brach sein Herz in seiner Brust.*"

The translation of Miss Faraday is based principally upon the text of the Leabhar na hUidhri, but where that MS is incomplete she has made use of the book of Lecan. Though intended for the general public, this translation deviates but little from the original text. One of the most valuable qualities of Miss Faraday's work is its honesty. Where she feels any doubt about the meaning of a word, she does not hesitate to make it known by the use of the question-mark. She has attempted, furthermore, to preserve the spirit of the original which, however, renders her translation somewhat incoherent and confusing at times. On account of the corrupt condition of the MS,[1] or for other reasons, she has frequently omitted entire passages, including some of the puzzling poems that are found interspersed in the text. These poems, which, by their complex and somewhat artificial construction, recall the Skaldic verses of the Icelandic Saga, are wisely left by Miss Faraday to the scholarship and ingenuity of Windisch and d'Arbois.

The bulky volume of Windisch is, after the Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus of Stokes and Strachan, the most important contribution to Irish literature in the last ten years. The text given in this work is based on the Book of Leinster, though carefully controlled by the Book of the Dun Cow and other MSS. This is accompanied by a very careful literal translation which renders the reading of the volume somewhat tedious. However, as the work is destined primarily for scholars, this objection is of little importance. In addition to the copious notes there is a vocabulary of some 150 pp., containing in the main words not to be found in the dictionary published in the first volume of the Irische Texte. The introduction, numbering some ninety pages, contains an interesting discussion of questions, historical or otherwise, raised by the Tain, and a study of the merits of the different MSS.

The translation of d'Arbois de Jubainville is practically indispensable to one possessing either of the other two works in that it combines their important qualities: for it is as scholarly as that of Windisch and more readable than that of Miss Faraday. While carefully following the text, the author has nevertheless

---

[1] Apparently, for the fact that Miss Faraday was unable to consult other MSS, is her translation unsafe at times. Cf., for example, the description of the troops in the "Call of the men of Connaught to Cruachain Ai", "the prophecy of Fedelm", "the death of Loch mac Mofemis", etc.

succeeded in avoiding the unnecessary repetitions that render the reading of the other translations somewhat wearisome. Among the numerous interesting things brought out in the introduction, which covers thirty of the eighty-three pages contained in the *première livraison*, are the points of resemblance between the Tain and the Iliad. They are not many to be sure, but are nevertheless of importance, for almost all of the work of this scholar in the field of religion is of considerable value. Finally this translation contains several photographic reproductions of Celtic monuments in the Musée de Cluny at Paris and elsewhere. For the above reasons, this work assumes a high rank among the recent additions to Celtic literature; and it is therefore with great pleasure that we look forward to its completion.

<div align="right">JOHN L. GERIG.</div>

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

REPORTS.

Pp. 1–8.   E. Wölfflin, Die Latinität der verlorenen Epitoma
Livii.   A notice of the dissertation of H. A. Sanders; see ALL.
X. 563 and Sanders, Die Quellencontamination im 21 und 22
Buche des Livius, Berlin, Mayer und Müller, 1898.

8.   E. Wölfflin, Prorsa, prosa.   Prosa=prorsa, i. e. provorsa
(oratio), in distinction from vorsa, or poetry.   Quint. still retained
the form prorsa, beside prosa.   W. favors omitting the relative
clause in *Quint. X. 1. 81, prorsam orationem, quam pedestrem
Graeci vocant, since Quint. in four passages of Book I alone uses
prosa without explanation.   The definition is besides incorrect.

9–26.   E. B. Lease, Zur Konstruktion von licet.   See review
in A. J. P. XIX. 214.

26.   E. Wölfflin, Euphemismus als Grund der Ellipse.   Such
cases as ubi ad Dianae veneris, Ter. Andr. 582, may be assumed
to have existed in very early times and are confined to the
names of gods until the Ciceronian period.   The omission was
probably euphemistic in its origin, and no substantive is to be
supplied; cf. εἰς ᾿Αιδου in Greek.

27–35.   E. Wölfflin, Zum Asyndeton bei Sallust.   The general
subject is first considered.   Bimembral asyndeton was very
common in the Italic languages and is frequent in archaic and
archaistic Latin.   Cicero uses it but seldom, avoiding it especially
in the case of verbs, but his example was not followed.   Its use
with the active and the passive of the same verb has been
regarded as peculiar to Silver Latin, but occurs in Catull. 45. 20.
Bimembral asyndeton with adjectives and substantives was
avoided by the more careful stylists; cf. Don. on Ter. Ad. 990;
but trimembral is common with verbs, adjectives and substan-
tives.   Asyndeton of four words is often divided into two parts by
the use of words of similar meanings, by alliteration, by rhyme,
and by similar devices.   Sallust in his earlier work connects the
second pair by atque, but later omits the conjunction, though
retaining it when a third pair is added.   When the pairs are in
a disjunctive relation, they are connected by aut, and aut in the
first pair should perhaps be deleted in some cases.   He also uses
praeterea, postremo, denique, etc.; rarely et, -que, and etiam.

24

Sallust uses bimembral asyndeton more freely than other writers of the same period. On account of his fondness for archaisms, it may be assumed that this was frequent in the lost prose works of the early period. His usage in his different works is not consistent, and it is impossible to reconstruct that of the Histories from his later imitators, on account of the impossibility of determining what is characteristic of S. and what is late Latin usage.

35–36. O. Hey, Actutum. For *at-tutum, "at a glance"; cf. ad nutum and contutus, obtutus. The change of att- to act- may be due to popular etymology, which connected the word with the stem ag-. Latrocinor. Lancino. Suggests reading the latter word for the former in Cels. i. praef. (p. 7. 35 D), mortui demum praecordia et viscus in conspectum latrocinantis (lancinantis) medici dari, in the sense of "cut in pieces, dissect".

37–59. R. Fuchs, Zu Serenus Sammonicus. Agrees with Teuffel-Schwabe that S. follows the best models in his verse technique. This is shown by the variety which he gives to common expressions, by his use of poetical for prosaic terms (for mare: pelagus, Doridis humor, Nereia lympha, etc.), in his choice of epithets, of which an alphabetical list is given, and in his use of metaphorical language. An examination of his morphology and syntax follows.

59. R. Fuchs, Zu Serenus Sammonicus V. 507. For scopulosa would read scrūposa, which is found in Plaut. Capt. 185.

60. E. Wölfflin, Bracchium. Gracchus. The original spelling was brachium and Gracus; the later forms were due to the analogy of Bacchus. According to the best MSS, Gracci is the spelling of Quint. in I. 5. 20.

61–70. W. Heraeus, Zur Appendix Probi. Some additions to the study of Carl Ullmann in Vollmöllers Roman. Forschungen, VII. 145–226, especially in the way of testimony to unusual forms of common words and the explanation of these by analogies found in the glosses.

70. W. Heraeus, Lecticocisium. This word, which is found in Not. Tir. p. 97. 65 f. Schm., should be read in the Serviusscholia on Verg. Aen. 8. 666, instead of laeta occisia.

71–79. R. Helm, Einige sprachliche Eigentümlichkeiten des Mythographen Fulgentius. F. was of African origin, and Latin was not his native language. This led him to use striking and unusual words, to give the impression of a command of the language which in fact he did not possess. His impression of the originality of the language and style of F. has led Helm to trust more to the MSS than previous editors, restoring to the text many words which had been called in question.

79-80. E. Wölfflin, Zur Epitoma Livii. Additions to the notes on the language on p. 1 ff. above.

81-85. C. H. Moore, Dediticius, dediticiorum numero, daticius. Notes on the signification of the first word. Dediticiorum numero occurs first in Gaius. Daticius must be recognized as a late Latin form (cf. ALL. V. 429), but dedicius (CGL. IV. 226. 9) may be a mere error in spelling, though such shortened forms are not uncommon; cf. ALL. V. 430 and 434.

86. J. Hausleiter, Quingenta vota. In the letter of Celerinus to Lucianus (Cypr. Epist. 21 Hartel) for pro seduta should be read pro se D vota, another example of the use of quingenti as a round number; see ALL. IX. 184.

87-97. G. Landgraf, Ueber den pseudocyprianischen Traktat "adversus Iudaeos". This work cannot have been written later than the first half of the fourth century and is probably a century older. The form of the citations from the Bible, and the language and style, show that it was not written by Cyprian. It was written in Rome, evidently by an intimate friend of Novatianus, if not by N. himself.

98. A. Sonny, Magis und minus ohne komparative Bedeutung. In Catull. 62. 58, where S. would read cara viro magis est, minus est invisa parenti, magis and minus = valde and non. In 73. 4 magis has the same meaning, while in 66. 87 and 68. 30 it has the force of Fr. mais, It. ma. Minus = non is found in quominus and si minus, as well as in Cic. Div. 1. 24; Ter. Eun. 737; and elsewhere. Quisquis = quisque. An example from class. Lat. in Catull. 68. 28. Cf. Cic. ad Fam. 6. 1. 1 Mendelssohn and CIL. I. 206. 13.

99-103. K. J. Hidén, Lucretiana. In 5. 1223 Lach. membra is not acc. of specification, but is the object of corripiunt. In 1. 317 manus is not acc. of specification, but is subject of the infinitive. An abl. quique was conjectured by Lachmann in 2. 372 and other instances are found in 5. 343 and 3. 700. It would be interesting to know whether this form is found elsewhere. An abl. quod is frequent in Lucr. in quod si, quod nisi and quod quoniam. Parallel to this is the use of hoc as an abl. of cause in the combination hoc ubi, of which nine examples are given, which are generally emended by the earlier editors.

103-104. G. Landgraf, Der Accusativ des Zieles nach vocare und hortari. The oldest instance of a supine in -um, which is an acc. of the goal, is asom (assum) fero on the cista from Praeneste. The use occurs in early Latin with vocare (citation in Cic. Mur. 26 and Plaut.), especially in the juristic language. It is also found with ciere and hortari, and from its use with the latter developed the rare use of the acc. of a substantive with hortari

(inc. inc. fab. 63). This perhaps originated in military language. It is especially common in Statius.

105-114. H. Städler, Nachtrag zu den lateinischen Pflanzen-namen im Dioskorides. A reply to the criticism of Wellmann (Festgabe für Franz Susemihl, 3. n) on the article in ALL. X. 83, (see A. J. P. XXVIII, 474), followed by a list of corrections based on a collation of codd. Constantinopolitanus and Neapolitanus in Vienna.

114. L. de Vasconcellos, Laciculus. This word, which is not found in the lexicons and supplements, is to be read in CIL. II. 2395.

115-118. A. Funck, Accrementum - accumbo. Lexicon articles.

119-134. Miscellen. K. Sittl, Nimbus, Heiligenschein. The definition of nimbus in this sense in Isid. Etym. 19. 31. 2 goes back to a number of passages in the Servius-commentary on Verg., all of which centre around the note on Aen. 2. 616. Der Namen Italiens. The Romans did not take the word 'Iταλία from the Oscans or from the colloquial language of Magna Graecia, which had a form with ϝ (Osc. Viteliu). The Attic form was introduced by Livius Andr., Naev., Enn., and the annalists who wrote in Greek. 'Iταλία was first applied to the most southern part of the peninsula, and its scope was gradually extended between the fourth and the second centuries, B. C. It is first applied to the whole peninsula by Polybius. Italicus ('Iταλικός) was not used as a genuine substantive. The Romans applied the term to the Allies during the Social War and called their capital Italica (instead of Italia). Italus was first a personal name; after the analogy of Thessalus it came into use through the poets of the Ciceronian and Augustan ages.

A. Döhring, Lat. an = atne. Supports this derivation (pro-posed by Skutsch, Forsch. zu lat. Gr. und Metr. 60) by an examination of the signification of the word in a number of passages.

W. M. Lindsay, Ueber die Länge des plautinischen "dat". The original inflection of do must have given *dōs, *dōt, which gave place to das, dat. In Plaut. Poen. 868 and less certainly in Most. 601 and Men. 101 we have dās and dāt, while there are no cases in the genuine works of Plaut. of dăs, dăt. The vowel was therefore long in his time.

A. Souter, Addenda Lexicis Latinis.

A. Sonny, Totidem = eadem. In Catull. 92. 3 totidem mea is not to be explained, with Ellis, as coming from the game of the duodecim chartae, nor to be emended. There is a parallel in

Hor. Sat. 2. 3. 298, and in the expression totidem verbis. Through a similar confusion of the ideas of quality and quantity we have totidem for itidem in later Latin, while tantumdem = idem occurs as early as Juvenal (3. 298). The same confusion occurs in the use of Fr. autant and It. altretanto. Multus, einflussreich. In Catull. 112

> Multus homo es, Naso, neque tecum multus homo . . .
> Descendit: Naso, multus es at pathicus

would give to the first multus the meaning, "influential" (cf. Gk. πολύς), to multus homo that of multi homines, and to the last multus that of "tiresome", comparing Plaut. Men. 316. In the gap at the end of the first line would read umquam.

H. Dessauer, Lupana. Two examples of this word in Quint. Decl. 14. 3 and 14. 12 according to both classes of MSS, though not according to the oldest MSS: cf. A. J. P. XXVII. 465 and 470. If these works are earlier than Apul. Met., these are the earliest instances of the word.

L. Havet, Coemptare? Suggests coemptabant for coemebant in Cic. Verr. 4. 133 as better suiting Cicero's prose rhythm. The editor cites promptare from promere.

W. Heraeus, Atribux. There is perhaps a connection between C. Gl. IV. 22. 37, atribux: senex atris buccis, and Auson. Ep. 22. 19 (cf. ALL. X. 513). In Arnob. 3. 14 would read atribuces for sacrivoces. Atribux is lacking in the lexicons and supplements.

135-144. Review of the Literature for 1897, 1898.

145-148. Vom Archive und vom Thesaurus. Review of the past and plans for the future.

149-196. Th. Birt, Das Arvallied. A new interpretation as a prayer for the continuance of spring. B. reads as follows:

> Enós Lasés iuváte. (ter)
> Nevel vérve Mármar síns incúrrere ín pleóres. (ter)
> Satúr fú fere Márs. Limén, salí; sta, vérver. (ter)
> Semúnís sali térnei ádvocápit cónctos. (ter)
> Enós Marmór iuvato. (ter)

The second line is rendered: "Do not, Mars, allow spring to perish (go over to the majority)". Limen, sali; sta, verver = "Gush forth, water; abide, spring". The fourth line means: "the Salius shall call thrice on all the Semones".

197-211. Edwards-Wölfflin, Von dem sogen. Genetivus und Ablativus qualitatis. Extracts from the dissertation of G. V. Edwards, The Ablative of Quality and the Genitive of Quality: New York, Evening Post Printing House, 1900.

212. E. Wölfflin, Zur Epitoma Livii. Notes on the deviations of the Epitoma from the subject matter of the original.

213–220. W. H. Kirk, Ueber etiam und etiam nunc. Etiam was first a temporal particle. Its meanings are not to be explained on the basis of varying accent in poetry, but on semasiological grounds. In Latin *eti gave place to etiam as the clearer and fuller expression. The new word had only the meaning of the first member, but gradually assumed other than temporal meanings, such as "also, indeed". For greater precision other temporal particles were added: etiam dum, etiam nunc, etiam tunc. Of these only etiam nunc became colloquial usage. It displaced etiam, which reappears in the archaistic writers. Etiam nunc was also incorrectly used of past time, beside etiam tunc. From the time of Cic. adhuc is found with the force of etiam nunc. In Plaut. the two words are written separate; etiamnunc is not found until after the time of Cicero. Examples of etiam = etiam nunc in Cicero's letters are given.

221–249. Landgraf - Weyman, Novatians epistula de cibis Iudaicis. The text of the work on this subject found in cod. auct. Lat. I Q. v. 39, in the Royal Library at St. Petersburg, fol. 70–77, is printed with textual notes and parallels from the acknowledged works of Novatianus. The conclusion is reached that the work must be identical with that of Novatianus bearing the same title.

249. J. van de Vliet, Olim oliorem. Would read this, in the sense of ipsa Antiquitate antiquiorem, instead of olim oliorum, in Petr. 43. Olim is regarded as an indeclinable personal name. In the following non mehercule . . . reliquisse would insert virginem after canem.

250. A. Woltjer, A, ab bei Lucretius. Corrections of ALL. IX. 465 ff.

251–260. W. Bannier, Zur Chronologie der Dichtungen Ovids. Notes on Ovid's use of personal names, with conclusions drawn from this as to the dates of the Metam. and other works written before the poet's banishment.

261–264. E. Wölfflin, Accumulate—accuro. Lexicon articles.

265–276. Miscellen. M. Flemisch, Zu Granius Licinianus. If this writer's work is based on Livy, he must have used the Epitoma, which was made before 30 A. D. Instances of poetic diction and of archaistic Latin are pointed out in his work, some of the latter the result of emendation. A list of other emendations follows.

A. Zimmermann, Römische Eigennamen. Suggests that Titus means son, beside Tata, father. Then Titus Tatius would

mean "papa's son". The suffix -ar, frequent in personal names in Illyria, Messapia and Etruria, occurs also in Oscan and in Latin (gens Afraria, Caesar, etc.). Beside these there are forms without -ar (Kaeso beside Caesar). Hence -ar may be a dimin. suffix, derived from the stem αρ- in ἄριστος.

O. Hey, Zu den Tierlaut-Zeitwörtern. Since the freq. and the simplex often appear side by side in these verbs (bombire-bombitare), in Tert. De Anima, 17, tonitru meditante, the correct reading may be mugitante, freq. of mugire. Ob civis servatos. This phrase on coins furnishes evidence for the persistence of the acc. in -is in the Augustan age. From the time of Tiberius cives prevails until after the fall of Nero, when the republican formula is revived, doubtless with premeditation.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE, XXX (1906).

Pp. 5–30 : Jean Lesquier, Greco-Egyptian Deeds of Divorce. A detailed study of the formulae employed in deeds of divorce found among the Greek papyri from Egypt.

Pp. 31–51 : Georges Ramain, The Law of the Antepenultimate Foot in the text of Terence. The law of the antepenultimate that was established for Plautus in a previous article (see A. J. P. XXVII 225), is shown to hold good for Terence also. According to this law, the arsis (unaccented part) of the fourth foot of the iambic senarius, of the fifth foot of the trochaic septenarius, and of the sixth foot of the iambic octonarius may not consist of an iambic word with shortened ultima (e. g. mihi), nor of a word that may become iambic by position (e. g. bonus), nor of two shorts that do not belong to the same word, nor of a short followed by a shortened long in a polysyllabic word (e. g. volup- in voluptatem), nor of the contracted forms mi, nil, dis, mis, ej, etc., for mihi, nihil, deis, meis, ei, etc. Of the 74 violations of the law in Terence, 50 readily yield to treatment, whilst the remainder are explained or corrected only with the exercise of considerable ingenuity on the part of the author.

Pp. 51–3 : Pierre Boudreaux, The Lexicon of Lucian. Bachmann, Anecdota Graeca, II, pp. 317–48, published a συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Λουκιανοῦ from the Coislinianus 345. Boudreaux recently made a new collation of this MS, and in the present article points out omissions and false readings in Bachmann's text, and furnishes many instances of failure on Bachmann's part to record in the critical apparatus emendations that he has incorporated in his text. Especially worthy of note are three hitherto unpublished scholia supplied by Boudreaux, and the full text of two other scholia, omitted by Bachmann and but

imperfectly published by Jacobitz on the sole basis of the Vindobonensis 123.

Pp. 54–7 : Max Bonnet, On the Letters of Cicero to Atticus (books IX and XII). Critical notes and an expression of the desirability of establishing a uniform practice of relegating all conjectures, no matter how convincing, to the bottom of the page.

Pp. 58–60 : Max Bonnet, Juvenal 1, 105. In opposition to Friedlaender and others, Bonnet, following a hint of the scholiast, insists that quadringenta of line 106 designates neither the property nor the annual income of the speaker, a freedman, but the property qualification of members of the equestrian order.

Pp. 61–70 : J. Vessereau and P. Dimoff, Rutiliana. I. The Birthplace of Rutilius Namatianus. From the fact that the name of Rutilius is not found in the inscriptions from Poitiers and Toulouse, it is argued that R. was born in neither of these places. On the other hand, the mention, in the inscriptions, of five Rutilii, one Rutilianus, and one Exsuperantius at Narbonne, viewed in the light of the personal and historical allusions of the " de reditu suo ", makes it probable that Narbonne was the birthplace of the author of that poem. II. The Date of Rutilius's Homeward Journey. The date given by the poet himself is 1169 A. U. C. This, according to the era of Varro, corresponds to 416 A. D., but, according to the era of Cato, to 417 A. D. In spite of the fact that the Varronian era was in general use among the Romans and is the era followed by modern historians, 417 A. D. was the date most generally accepted by scholars before Zumpt's investigations ; but as a result of these investigations, 416 has come into general favor. Since the adoption of 416 A. D. leads to other difficulties, the authors of the present article have gone over the entire question anew, and they feel that, when viewed in the light of chronological and astronomical data obtained from other sources, the various allusions in Rutilius point to October 13 as the day of departure from Rome ; that the fifteen days' stay at Porto extended from the 14th to the 28th ; and that the day of embarkation was the 29th. Only the year 417 A. D. will fit these dates, so that it is likely that Rutilius, contrary to general usage, was following the Catonian era when he designated 1169 as the date of his departure from Rome.

Pp. 71–84 : Reviews and Book Notices.

Pp. 85–9. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Die griechische Litteratur und Sprache. Translation by Mme J. Weil of the Introduction of this work.

Pp. 90–100 : René Pichon, The Text of Quintus Curtius and Metrical Prose. Quintus Curtius as a rule follows the laws of metrical prose and is specially fond of the clausulae $-\cup--\stackrel{\cup}{-}$,

—◡ ——◡̆ , —◡ ◡◡—◡̆ . Pichon gives a list of the instances of non-metrical close in the order of their occurrence, explaining or removing as many examples as possible. As stylistically important for Quintus Curtius is noted the fact that many of the exceptions occur in short sentences, the tone of which is more distinctly narrative than that of the longer sentences. From the point of view of literary history, Curtius's fidelity in the observance of the laws of rhythmical prose leads the author to assign the historian to a comparatively late date, to a period in which rhetoric dominated everything without regard to department.

Pp. 101–4: R. Dareste, The δίκη ἐξούλης in Athenian Law. Our knowledge of the δίκη ἐξούλης is derived almost solely from the ancient lexicographers; but the action taken by Plesidippus in the Rudens of Plautus (a translation of a play of Diphilus) against Labrax, who had sought to carry off Palaestra, the Athenian girl, after having sold her to Plesidippus and having accepted earnest-money from him, is of the nature of an ἐξούλης δίκη, and is made the subject of a careful analysis by Dareste.

P. 104: L. Havet, Hirtius, bell. Gall. 8, 4, 1. Read tota instead of tot.

Pp. 105–7: Georges Ramain, Aetna. Verse 69 read utrimque truces; 119, aut uno rursus for ac torres uno; 395, experiuntur for eripiantur.

P. 108: B. Haussoullier, Inscription from the Piraeus. H. republishes an inscription already edited with commentary by E. Nachmanson in Athen. Mitth. XXX, 391–8, and states that the stone on which the original inscription is found, is preserved in the Museum of Brussels.

Pp. 109–10: Aug. Audollent, Tertullian de idololatr. 8. Read donum for domum in the phrase aut etiam domum fabricaueris.

Pp. 111–22: A. Dieudonné, Delian Account of Meilichides. The original of this inscription is preserved in the Cabinet des Médailles. A copy of it was published by Le Bas (Voy. archéolog., No. 2092) in 1848, but Dieudonné presents a more exact and more complete copy together with a transliteration, in which many of the lacunae have been supplied. The text is followed by explanatory notes, chiefly of a prosopographic nature.

Pp. 122–3: M. Roger, The Commentariolum in artem Eutycii of Sedulius Scottus. The supposed Codex Bobiensis of Hagen is shown to be Par. 7830 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, and hence Sedulius' commentariolum is known to us by only two MSS, the Zurich and the Paris.

Pp. 124–38: E. Rey, On the Authenticity of Fortunatus' two poems De excidio Thuringiae (App. 1) and Epist. ad Artachin

(App. 3), wrongly attributed to Saint Radegunda. In 1888, Ch. Nisard tried to show that the above-mentioned poems were written by Saint Radegunda and not by Fortunatus, as had been generally supposed up to that time. In 1891, after a partial but careful examination of the composition, style, and language of the poems, Lippert decided in favor of Fortunatus' authorship. Apparently unconvinced by Lippert, Em. Briand, whose biography of Radegunda appeared in 1898, adopted Nisard's view. Rey, to put an end to this superstition as he views it, undertook to complete the investigation begun by Lippert, and has shown that the style, composition, vocabulary, syntax, and versification of the De excidio and the Ep. ad Artachin possess exactly the same qualities, good or bad, that characterize the authentic works of Fortunatus, and he insists that the inflated pathos and the highly declamatory tone of the two poems do not at all harmonize with the genuine outpourings of a grief-stricken heart like that of Radegunda, but are just what would be looked for in a work of the Italian poet.

P. 139: C. E. Ruelle, Orphica, περὶ λίθων, 221 Abel. Read τὸν (= αὐτὸν) for the vulgate σὺν or for Schneider's σὴν.

Pp. 139–40: R. de Labriolle, On Tertullian, ad Uxorem I, 4 (Oehler I, p. 674, l. 14). Tertullian is here not referring to widows but to virgins. Hence the text must be changed either by following the Vindobonensis and substituting permissis for praemissis, or else by returning to the reading of the earliest editions, quae nulla formae vel aetatis occasione pressae maritis sanctitatem anteponunt.

P. 140: Louis Havet, Pomponius Mela 3, 52. For utuntur read uehuntur and place armati after uehuntur.

Pp. 141–2: B. Haussoullier, Archaic Inscription from Cumae. In the inscription οὐ θέμις ἐντοῦθα κεῖσθαι IME τὸν βεβαχχευμένον published by Sogliano, Atti della R. Acc. dei Lincei 1905, Notizie II, p. 377 ff., H. thinks that IME stands for (ε)ὶ μή, and not for με as S. supposes. Haussoullier's idea is that those who had been initiated in the mysteries of Dionysus formed an association and erected the stone bearing this inscription to mark their portion of the burying-ground.

Pp. 143–60: Reviews and Book Notices.

Pp. 161–72: J. Bidez, Fragments of an Unknown Greek Philosopher or Rhetorician. Publication, with critical notes, of British Museum papyrus CCLXXV. B. used a photograph of the papyrus, and his text was carefully collated with the original by Mr. H. I. Bell of the British Museum, to whom, as well as to Mr. F. G. Kenyon, B. acknowledges the greatest obligations. The papyrus consists of two fragments, each of which is so badly

mutilated that not a single line has been preserved intact. The
MS was written for the book-market in the third cent. A. D. It
is a copy of a philosophical treatise on the duties and virtues of
kings. There is no certain trace of a proper name. In a letter
to Bidez, part of which is published here, Gomperz points out
that there are no traces of post-Platonic philosophy in these
fragments, but that there are unmistakable evidences of Socratic
doctrine, and as he detects also numerous references to a king
that exercised a world-wide dominion, he concludes that we may
have before us the remains of a Socratic dialogue, the remains,
perhaps, of the Cyrus of Antisthenes.

Pp. 172: Louis Havet, Phaedrus 3, 4, 6–7. For et . . . et read
ut . . . ita.

Pp. 173–206: Louis Havet, Studies in the Eunuchus of Terence.
Verse 1: Read si quisquam est *hic*, placere *qui* studeat bonis.
3: Omit hic. 4: Read dictum *prius* for *est qui* dictum. 7: Ea-
dem for easdem. 8: Latina . . . bona for Latinas . . . bonas.
9: This verse should precede 7, and for nunc read nouam. 11:
Comma should follow, not precede, aurum. 16: Comma after
erret, and ut for et. 37 and 38 are intrusions. 41: Second dic-
tum should precede quod. 44: Semicolon after silentio. 50–7:
With Donatus and the ancient MSS place the sigla PA before 57,
not before 50. 62: Read rationem for ratione. 67: Istaec for haec.
99: Tu for huc. 107: Samia is probably a corruption for some
courtezan's name. 132: Heres for hanc. 152: The reading nil
respondes mi? Tibin? is suggested. 158: Haec nunc uerba is a
Hellenism and equals ταῦτα τὰ νῦν ῥήματα. 168: Place a period
after repperi. 169: Semicolon after dedi. uiginti need not be
changed to remove the apparent inconsistency between 169 and
984. 185: For "non fiet; hoc" read "non fiet aut;". 187:
Period after ibo; ego for hoc. 190: Insert tu before Thais. 196:
animus in this verse means feeling. 197: Read forsit for forsitan
(so also in Andr. 957); also paruom for paruam. 202: Insert a
second huius before causa. 207: Perhaps facito is to be read for
fac ita. 211–2: Istuc and hoc refer to the same thing. 224:
Uide quid agas is not intended for the master's ear. stat sen-
tentia forms the close of the master's soliloquy. 230: Insert haec
after honesta. 231: Strike out hoc. 232: Put mark of exclama-
tion after intellegens. 234: H. thinks that the key to the word
hodie is contained in Menander's Colax. 238: me noti is the
preferable order. 240: At the close read in te *esset* tibi. 245:
For his read is. 250: At the beginning read s<et> et is. 251:
For the first id read idem. 257: For "lanii, coqui" read "lanii,
aucupes". The false reading is due to Cicero, who de officiis 1,
150, under the influence of Trinum. 407, misquotes this verse of
Terence. 260–1: A verse has dropped out between these two
lines. 266: Read has for hanc. 267: Read St! for Sed. 273:
An attempt to explain ne sis as a continuation of the reply Quia

tristi's. 289: Insert hac after filium. 291–2: Make one line of the two by striking out nescio. 299: amare is a corruption of amo<rem, e>re, which words originally stood before dices in 300.

Pp. 207–9: Louis Méridier, A Commonplace of the Second Sophistic. Lucian, Rhet. Praec. § 18, gives the following advice to the prospective rhetorician: ὁ Ἄθως πλείσθω καὶ ὁ Ἑλλήσποντος πεζευέσθω καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ὑπὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν βελῶν σκεπέσθω. Méridier thinks that the allusion to these incidents of the Persian war was a matter of tradition with the Sophists and that Lucian was indulging in a fling at the Sophists in general and at Aristides in particular; for in the Panathenaicus of Aristides there are references to the navigation of Mt. Athos and to the obscuration of the sun by the Persian arrows, and in both the Polemarchicus and the fifth eclogue of Himerius Lucian's advice seems to have been followed almost to the letter.

Pp. 210–7: A. Cartault, Horace and Tibullus. Cartault thinks that the Albius to whom Horace addressed C. I, 33 and Epist. I, 4, is the poet Tibullus, but he is not satisfied with the superficial explanation given of these poems. So he presents what he considers to be a correct interpretation of them. He accepts the hypothesis that the anonymous mistress of Tibullus IV, 13, is the Glycera of Hor. C. I, 33. Tibullus was particularly loud in his expressions of grief over the unfortunate termination of this love-affair with Glycera, and Horace bids him not to give vent to his feelings in miserabiles elegi. As a result of this advice, these elegi, though contemplated, were never written. These occurrences took place about 24 or 25 B. C. Tibullus now retired to the country to lead a life of seclusion. Horace, not having heard from him for some time, became uneasy about him, and addressed Epist. I, 4 to him, admonishing him to return to the gay life of the capital and to the pursuit of lyric poetry. In view of the fact that the greater part of the second book of Tibullus is devoted to Nemesis, it is not unlikely that Tibullus yielded to the advice of Horace, returned to Rome, and thereupon fell a victim to the charms of Nemesis, his last mistress.

Pp. 218–43: Paul Monceaux, The Works of Petilianus, Donatist Bishop of Constantine. Only a very small portion of the Donatist literature has thus far been published. In collecting the materials for a volume on Donatism, Monceaux has been able to recover a great deal of this literature, and in some cases, entire works. In the present article, he limits himself to the description and publication of one entire work of Petilianus, to wit, Petiliani Epistula ad presbyteros et diaconos Donatistas adversus Catholicam, the text of which, comprising twenty pages, has been extracted from Augustine's Contra litteras Petiliani. Petilianus was born of Catholic parents and confirmed in the Catholic church, but he was later won over by the Donatists, and,

though a lawyer by profession, was by them elected to the bishopric of Constantine. He soon became one of the leaders of the sect. At the celebrated Conference of Carthage, in 411, he played a leading rôle. Though the decision was adverse to the Donatists, Petilianus was unyielding. A few years later, he was present at a Donatist council. Of the remainder of his life, there is no record. His works comprise 1, The letter mentioned above, written about 400 or 399 A. D. 2, A long letter that constitutes a reply to Augustine's Bk. I, Contra litteras Petiliani. This second letter was written about 401, and the general contents together with some important fragments have been brought to light by M. 3, Other letters and a work on the Maximianist schism. About these we have but meagre information. 4, A treatise De unico baptismo, of which there remain considerable fragments. 5, A rich collection of minor speeches, which have survived intact.

Pp. 244–8 : Reviews and Book Notices.

Pp. 249–70 : Louis Havet, Studies in the Eunuchus of Terence. (Continuation from pp. 173–206.) Verse 306 : Retain the order prorsus sum oblitus. 312 : Omit sigla for Parmeno and read siue adeo in the sense of "or rather". 316–7 : Exegetical notes. 319–20 : For precario read "pretio uel, Parmeno, | precario", and for nihil read nil. Flos ipsum of the Bembinus may be correct, flos being neuter. 322 : For amisti read amisti isti. 328 : For hanc read illam (or eam) hac. 351 : Retain noui of the MSS and for ubi siet read ubist. 353 : Read Quis *iste* tam potens cum tanto munere*st*? 355 : Read quod dono huic contra donum. 356 : Not tum but -ne is to be omitted, and perhaps also nam. PA. should be placed before, instead of after, hercle. 370 (and 741) : Read illi (archaic gen.) for illius. 371 : Keep the order illum esse. 372 : Read illi (adv.) for illis (illius). 375 : Read "facile ut pro eunucho . . . CH. Probe ;" instead of "facile ut pro eunucho probes. CH." 377 : Read pote for potes. 381 : faba means planchet here, not bean ; cudetur, will be stamped. 384 : Read despicatu, quae nos. 385 : ab is. 386 : For patri read pati and for fieri read pater. 387 : Perhaps factum merito (DG) is preferable to merito factum. 404 : It is best to suppress aut. 409 : Read homo hominum for hominum. 412 : inritare for inuidere. 418–9 : Instead of starting at Di uestram, Parmeno utters only et illum sacrilegum ! 425 : Read quid <tu> ais, homo inquam inpudens. 447 : For tu read diu and place it before quod. 451 : at (DGF) is better than ac. 463 : Read Itur for itura and put a period after hodie. Bene pol fecisti hodie is addressed to the soldier. 591 : For ita read iam. 701 : Retain uestem but place it before is, and read mi (D) for mihi. 772 : Retain satius est. 781 : Read Tu hos statue hic. 853 : For admisero read admisso. 1037 : Transpose the words Audin tu hic quid ait ? to the end of the verse and assign them to the soldier.

Pp. 271-4: C. E. Ruelle, Locus desperatus in Aristoxenus, Harmonics, p. 40 Meib. Read τὸ γὰρ ὑπερβολαίας καὶ μέσης <καὶ τὸ παραμέσης> καὶ ὑπάτης τῷ αὐτῷ γράφεται σημείῳ. The νήτη ὑπερβολαίων of the Hypodorian (lowest) τόνος and the μέση of the Hyperphrygian (highest) τόνος are both designated by the same letter, and the same thing is true of the παραμέση of the Hypodorian τόνος and the ὑπάτη of the Hyperphrygian.

Pp. 275-85: Salomon Reinach, The Tomb of Ovid. The famous Italian humanist and poet Pontano relates that he had more than once heard George of Trebizond say that he had read in some good author that the citizens of Tomi had at public expense erected a funeral monument to the poet Ovid before the gate of their town. Rhodiginus (Lodovico Ricchieri), in his Commentarii, quotes the fragments of one Caecilius Minutianus Apuleius as his authority for the statement that the inhabitants of Tomi had erected a tomb to Ovid before the door of his house. Against Merkel and Crusius, who consider these fragments a fabrication of Rhodiginus, Reinach champions the cause of the Rovigo scholar. He claims that the information of both Pontano and Rhodiginus is traceable ultimately to Planudes as its source. The mutilated MS that Rhodiginus possessed and believed to be the work of Apuleius, was the work of a humanist of the 14th century. Its sources are two little treatises of the grammarian Apuleius (10th or 11th cent.); some charlatanic scholia on the Ibis of Ovid; and a Greek account of Ovid. The Pseudo-Apuleius of Achilles Statius is probably an incomplete and hastily prepared copy of the Rhodiginus Apuleius with fraudulent additions. In conclusion, Reinach expresses the opinion that two verses cited by Rhodiginus as Plautine verses, should be included by the editors among the fragments of Plautus.

Pp. 286-304: Paul Monceaux, The Works of Petilianus. (Continuation from pp. 218-43.) Summary of the contents and publication of the fragments of the Epistula ad Augustinum. The source of these fragments is Augustine's Book III Contra litteras Petiliani.

P. 305: Georges Ramain, Plautus, Captivi 928. For ex animo et *cura* read ex animo et *corde*.

Pp. 306-7: Félix Gaffiot, The first six verses of the Eunuchus. Defence of the traditional reading against Havet, who treated these verses pp. 173 ff. (see above).

P. 308: Louis Havet, Georgics 3, 257. Read fricat arbore costas | *aeque* hinc atque illinc, *umerosque* ad uolnera durat.

Pp. 309-10: J. Marouzeau, Emphasis by Separation. Havet (Mélanges Nicole, pp. 225-32) established the fact that the effect of the separation of two words that compose a group, by one or

more unrelated words, is to emphasize one of the elements of the group. Marouzeau adduces examples to show that in the particular case of a group consisting of a qualifier and the word qualified, it is always the qualifier that is emphasized by the separation, no matter what its relative position to the intervening word or words.

Pp. 311–2: J. Marouzeau, On a certain Latin Construction. Marouzeau points out that in Terence, Ad. 590–1, with the current punctuation, there would be a violation of the rule uniformly observed by Plautus and Terence that in a relative clause, consisting of subject, copula, and predicate, the order of the copula and predicate is determined by the relative importance of the two. He therefore proposes to punctuate unum quicquid, quod quidem erit, bellissimum | carpam instead of "erit bellissimum, | carpam" and shows that his text is in every respect more satisfactory than the current one.

Pp. 313–24: Reviews and Book Notices.

Revue des Revues for the year 1905.

C. W. E. MILLER

BRIEF MENTION.

To be hopelessly behind the times means nothing more to me than the hopelessness of living until the pendulum swings back, until the whirligig comes round. The Fool's Paradise out of which you have been thrust is sure to become once more the Land of Beulah, if you wait long enough. The only question is whether it is worth while to wait. Some years ago a young scholar wrote contemptuously of the old theory of the subjunctive as the mood of the will and the optative as the mood of the wish, and hailed the new light of the stronger and weaker future. The old theory! How well I remember when the old theory was born and what a comfort it was to its godfathers, for the father did not seem so very proud of his offspring after all. And now the old theory returns again to reign in the pages of Stahl. I was one of the first on this side of the water to hail Westphal and Rossbach as the Great Twin Brethren who should deliver our souls from the troubled waters of the μέτρα κατ' ἀντιπάθειαν μικτά, and I was the first to seize the clue offered in Heinrich Schmidt's Leitfaden; and the system of metres incorporated in my Latin Grammar of 1872 was influenced by Schmidt. Others followed. Shortly afterwards, Professor John Williams White translated Schmidt and the great Hellenist Jebb adopted the new schemes in his monumental Sophokles. In 1885, the date of my Pindar, I still followed Schmidt without wavering—for the schemes of my Pindar are his—despite the jeers of the professionals at the standard raised by an amateur, a manner of metrical Schliemann. One professional, however, rejoiced to see Schmidt's day and that was Lehrs. The Dindorfian schemes had never given me much comfort and I had read my choruses by ear until the new lights came and then I found a certain charm in συγκοπή and τονή and fancied that I felt a certain ἦθος in the logaoedics and the dactyloepitrites, very much, doubtless, as Hamerton's Frenchman enjoyed his own recitation of Tennyson's Claribel, 'vare Claribel lov lee-ess'. Even after the trumpet of doom had given forth some ominous notes, I was old-fashioned enough to ask what had become of the ἦθος of the Horatian metres, and to feel a little shock at the irreverent way in which Wilamowitz treated the Glyconic (A. J. P. XVI 393).

Since then Professor White himself has become an enopliac. Since then like Horace's *adulta virgo*, this adulterous generation 'motus doceri gaudet Ionicos'. The ἑλκεχίτων Ionian reigns in the

stead of the high-girt Dorian, and it is, as we shall see, only God's mercy that keeps the soaring heroic hexameter from flapping its wings to the tune of ἔμε δείλαν ἔμε πασᾶν κακοτάτων πεδέχοισαν.   No wonder that a timorous soul who has no vocation for the part of a Pentheus mumbles the words of Teiresias in the Bacchae: οὐδὲν σοφιζόμεσθα τοῖσι δαίμοσι, and does homage to the antispast of which he once spoke disrespectfully (A. J. P. XIV 259), lest he like Pentheus be rent asunder.   No Pentheus he, no Teiresias either, but a miserable Strepsiades, ἀπόλλυμαι δείλαιος κτέ.

It was in this humble frame of mind that I opened a recent number of the *Neue Jahrbücher* (April, 1908), and found the text of a lecture delivered by Professor FRIEDRICH MARX of Bonn, the successor of Buecheler, *Ueber die neueren Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der griechischen und lateinischen Metrik.*   It is not exactly a case of the backward swing of the pendulum, it is not a case of the turn about of the whirligig, it is not a case of *redeunt Saturnia regna*, but it is a vindication of the right of the modern scholar over against the abject submission now in fashion to the dictates of the ancient metricians.   MARX is not one of those who yield to the πάτριοι παραδοχαί with that same Teiresias, not one of those who say with him :

οὐδεὶς αὐτὰ καταβαλεῖ λόγος
οὐδ᾽ εἰ δι᾽ ἄκρων τὸ σοφὸν ηὕρηται φρενῶν.

As I owe to the retrogressive movement of the last few years my exile from the field of Pindaric study (A. J. P. XXVI 359), I may perhaps be pardoned for the interest I have taken in MARX's discourse, which is quite too popular for such a Journal as this, and for the following summary of the same.

After an introduction in which he tells of the fascination that metrical problems have exercised on the Greek mind from the beginning and in which he enumerates the recent additions to our large stock of metrical documents, additions which he does not esteem so highly as some others do, MARX proceeds to ask what is the value of all this tradition and gives a sketch of the modern history of metric.   We must not underrate the moderns.   There were, to begin with, the three great Britons, the three great fuglemen, Bentley in his editions of Horace and Terence, Porson in the Preface to his Hecuba, and Elmsley in his various commentaries.   Of the discoveries of these great explorers, of the treatment of the close of the Latin senarius and septenarius, of the close of the Greek trimeter, the Porson

25

Law of the final cretic, the behaviour of the anapaest, of all
this there is no trace in the old metricians and grammarians,
any more, I would add, than there is any trace in the old gram-
marians of Scaliger's Law of the composition of Greek words, a
discovery not to be overestimated in its reach. On the lines of
Bentley and Porson, Gottfried Hermann, 'the greatest metrician
and, as may well be maintained, the greatest philologian of the
nineteenth century', built up his system, which culminated in the
'Elementa doctrinae metricae', and built it up regardless of what
the old metricians had to say. It was Hermann against Hephais-
tion and Hermann triumphant. It was not until the close of the last
century that the reaction set in, that reaction which MARX considers
a retrogression, and now it is practically Masqueray (1899) against
Hermann, as it was Hermann against Hephaistion (cf. C. W. E.
Miller, A. J. P. XX 331–3). There had been mutterings of the
storm before. The eminent dean of French Hellenists, Weil, had
given the signal of revolt and, in a dedication to Weil two years
before the appearance of Masqueray's book, Wilamowitz, the
archagitator, had praised the 'lux veteris doctrinae' as opposed
to the 'fatuus ignis et fallax novorum placitorum'. The catchy
measure of the Phalaecean which captivated Tennyson, 'O you
chorus of indolent reviewers', the familiar hendecasyllabic, yields
to Wilamowitz, as it yielded to Varro, an Ionic trimeter, and the
Oxyrhynchos man read the verse the same way. <Death to the
logaoedic! 'Passer mortuus est meae puellae'>. But what are
we to do with Hephaistion who is followed by Masqueray, and
who reads the Phalaecean as an iambic trimeter with initial anti-
spast, — ŏ — ∪ | ∪ — ∪ — | ∪ ⊿ — ? 'Lugete o veneres
cupidinesque'. Leo follows Wilamowitz, and Blass in his Bak-
chylides preaches a return to Hephaistion and Aristeides.

———

'Now what are we to hold', asks MARX, 'of the uninterrupted
transmission <the apostolic, or better tactual succession> of met-
rical tradition'? As for the poets themselves, it is impossible to tell
whether they had a clear and certain consciousness of the metrical
laws they developed with such admirable feeling for the beautiful
or whether it was all unconscious, all instinctive. We cannot tell
whether the Attic poets of the fifth century had the same rhyth-
mical and metrical conception as the poets of Sappho's time. As
for Horace, MARX considers it an established fact that he owed
his metrical knowledge to what we should call scientific study.
'Nor is there the least doubt', continues MARX, 'that with the
annihilation of Athens at the end of the fifth century, the old
tradition went to pot'. The second verse of the elegiac distich
we call a pentameter; and so did Hermesianax, who flourished
in the fourth century (see K. F. Smith, A. J. P. XXII 165). But
this so-called pentameter is a measure based on the mechanical

division of the verse into two dactyls, a spondee and two anapaests, and this measurement <of which unsparing fun used to be made> has actually found an advocate in recent times, Herr Schultz in the Hermes of 1900. To be sure, Augustin read the verse with a pause of two morae at the middle and of two morae at the end, but this <which we used to regard as a glimmer of the truth> Schultz looks upon as a proof of the decline of a sound tradition. 'He who accepts Hermesianax's reading of the pentameter', says Marx, 'ought to welcome the gentleman in Marius Victorinus VI 73, 25, who reads, Ζεὺς δὲ θεῶν ἀγορὴν ποιήσατο τερπικέραυνος—trochee, iambus, pyrrhic, spondee. —∪∪—∪∪—— ∪∪—∪∪——. This is no more absurd than the addition of an anapaestic marching rhythm, a dipodic structure, to a dactylic singing rhythm, a monopodic structure, as is postulated in the Hermesianactic pentameter.'

———

Much stress is laid by MARX, as by everybody else, though not in the same way, on the testimony of Aristotle, Rh. III c. 8 in which he rejects for prose rhythm the dactylic movement because it is σεμνός (A. J. P. VII 407; cf. Verrall on Choëph. 973), 1 : 1, the iambic because it is λέξις ἡ τῶν πολλῶν, 2 : 1, and the trochee likewise, 2 : 1, because it is κορδακικώτερος, whereas he recommends the paeon which belongs to the third rhythmical γένος, the ἡμιόλιον, 1½ : 1, the paeon primus (—∪∪∪) being suitable for the beginning, the paeon quartus (∪∪∪—) for the close of a sentence, inasmuch as the rhythm does not strike the ear so plainly as the others. This Aristotle speaks of as a new discovery of his own, which shows that as far back as Aristotle metre was based on scientific investigation, not on living tradition. Is the Macedonian right? He asserts not only that no verses are made of paeons, and hence the value of the rhythm for prose, but he does not recognize the equivalence of the cretic and the paeon <though Cicero does so distinctly> and has committed thereby a grave blunder according to MARX and one that has propagated itself down to our day. It appears from the Hymn on the Pythian Apollo 517 that the ἰηπαιήων and the Κρητικὸν μέλος are identical and the name Κρητικόν is vouched for by Kratinos 222 K. There is no distinction between the paeon and the creticus as we see from the inscriptional Delphic hymn, which is accompanied by the notes and so forms the best commentary on the Homeric hymn. Now this cretic cannot be separated from the last metron of the iambic trimeter and trochaic tetrameter catalectic —∪—. Verses are made of paeons after all, but the hemiolion proportion 2 : 3 is available only for prose, not for poetry. We are, therefore, not bound by the authority of Aristotle or by the authority of any ancient metrician. The cretic is equal to the paeon and represents not $\frac{6}{8}$ but $\frac{6}{8}$ time. The inscriptional Del-

phic hymn has unfortunately no notes designating the quantity, which would settle the matter finally so that the editors who have transcribed the hymn into modern musical notation have done so now in $\frac{6}{8}$ now in $\frac{6}{8}$ time.

———

These errors of the ancient metricians furnish, according to MARX, ample justification of Gottfried Hermann's rejection of their authority. The poets themselves supply the material. The ancient metricians are not guides. They are only fellow-workers. The knowledge of the old metric and the old music perished with the poets themselves and the later imitators made something new out of the traditional metrical schemes <The *Pegaseium nectar* of Sappho becomes the cut-loaf sugar of Horace, as I have somewhere described the process>. Metrical science began to be fruitful only when the searcher freed himself from the doctrine of the old metricians, and what is true of Greek poetry is true of Latin also. Of the subtle laws of Latin scenic poetry, no Latin grammarian knows anything. Phaedrus <perhaps, however, because he was a Greek (A. J. P. XV 520)> was not acquainted with the fine points of the earlier craftsmen. By the close of his verse Apuleius shows that he is a 'Numida' and 'semi-Gaetulus' and Avienus in the fourth century is guilty of popúlus and agére, the most un-Latin of all accentuations. On the other hand, Aristotle is triumphantly right as to the law of prose; and the paeon measured as he measured it, in $\frac{5}{8}$ time, does not suggest poetic rhythm, for this time was entirely alien to poetry or at all events was as rare as it is in modern music <where it actually occurs. See Pindar I. E. lxvi, though the occurrence has been otherwise interpreted>. On this whole matter of the clausula much time and labor has been spent of late <and one cannot well see how an editor of an ancient orator could afford to neglect it (A. J. P. XXV 227). See Kroll's new ed. of Cicero's Brutus and compare K. F. Smith's summary of Zielinski, A. J. P. XXV 453 foll.>, but MARX thinks that we have not learned much more than the ancient rhetoricians have taught us. Still something is to be gained from the study of the prose usage for the appreciation of the metre of the poets. The ditrochaeus, a favorite clausula of the orators, must have had quite a different character from the verse closes that are apparently fashioned in the same way. The ithyphallicus is to be read — ∪ — ∪ —ᴵ — , the ionicus — ∪ — ∪ — ⏝ and the acatalectic trochaic verses that ought to end in a ditrochaeus are not at all in use as one can see from the metres of Terence <LG' 769, 774 Note>.

———

And here I should like to discontinue my summary of MARX, satisfied as I am with his vindication of the rights of modern

analysis. So far I am in sympathy with him. As well reject Penrose's measurements of Greek architecture, because his mathematical formulae cannot be found in any ancient author. But the next step is somewhat disillusioning to one who has dealt with all the schemes that are set forth in my Pindar. 'Are we justified', asks MARX, 'in taking our modern rhythmical sense and our modern musical notions as a standard for the analysis of Greek and Roman metres'? 'This is', as MARX says, 'a question of great, in fact, of fundamental importance'. The Ayes and Noes are both equally confident. Lehrs f. i. flew in the face of tradition when he measured the iambus and trochee not as ⅜ or ¾ but as ²⁄₄ and the cretic likewise. To Gottfried Hermann χρυσέα φόρμιγξ 'Απόλλωνος καὶ ἰοπλοκάμων <my beloved dactylo-epitrite> was a mixture of ⅜ and ²⁄₄ times — ∪ — — — ∪ — — — ∪∪ — ∪∪ — . The opposition to Hermann came from Apel, a literary fellow, not a philologian at all, who made an energetic demand for unity of time, for the reduction of the dactyl to ⅜ time; and in substantiation of his claim, he appealed to the notorious passage of Dionysios de Comp. c. 17, where the cyclic anapaest is mentioned. According to MARX the passage of Dionysios has nothing to do with the question in hand. Meanwhile, a real philologian had taken hold of the doctrine of the equality of the bars and Boeckh's famous de metris Pindari (1811) <which was a terrible shock to the Graeca Maiora people> demanded 'unitatem variorum temporis articulorum', for 'sine temporis aequalitate, quem nostri tactum vocant, rhythmica compositio ulla nec recitari queat nec cantari nedum saltari. <Ernst von Leutsch, who manuducted me into the study of metres, was a passionate dancer before gout laid him by the heels, and 'nedum saltari' meant a good deal to him.> 'The various ways in which, since the days of Boeckh, the uniformity of time has been restored', says MARX coldly, 'have only a mathematical interest'. Especially noteworthy, however, is Boeckh's reference to the remains of Aristoxenos, the most renowned musical theorist of antiquity, and to his doctrine of ἀλογία and ἄλογος, which Boeckh applied to the ancipites at the end of the trochaico-iambic μέτρα. This theory was taken up by Westphal and Rossbach, who sought to bring about a mediation between the Hermannian view and the Boeckhian. Hermann thrust the ancient metricians aside. Westphal hoped everything from Aristoxenos, a hope which MARX thinks has been frustrated <a sad verdict to one who recalls the interest the book inspired and the indignation with which the slighting expression 'one Aristoxenos' was once resented, A. J. P. XI 126>. 'The scant remains of Aristoxenos', says MARX, 'throw no light on the most important questions and problems nor the new fragments either'. We are in a region of possibilities, not probabilities. Aristoxenos, like Aristotle, is only a fellow theorist. His reputation as an historian has suffered scath and so he may be quite as untrustworthy when he writes on music.

After Westphal new paths were sought. The new paths turn
out to be the old paths. In his memorable study of the inscrip-
tion of Isyllos of Epidauros, Wilamowitz, treating of the ionici in
the lyric poets, returns to the old metricians. He disdains to
prove that the choriambus has the same value as the ionicus (' not
to be proved ', says MARX). He simply declares the choriambus a
legitimate anaklasis of the ionicus and assumes ionic verses in
which the pure ionicus is everywhere forbidden and the second
foot is always choriambic. This doctrine MARX declines to accept
as he declines to follow Otto Schroeder, who resolves the dactylo-
epitrites into ionici as did the ancient metricians. Here, for once,
MARX is in sympathy with Boeckh, who demands as a basis the
proof of pure ionici in Pindar: Apage cum ionico cuius nullum
extat in Pindaricis certum exemplum. The ionicus has so many
forms that with Schroeder's Ionicum maius $- - \cup \cup$, minus
$\cup \cup - -$, and medium $- \cup \cup -$, syllaba anceps, and anaklasis, you
can make anything out of anything. Why not work upon the
dactylic hexameter as an ionic verse? Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληιάδεω
'Αχιλῆος $=$ Ionicum medium + minus + medium + minus: $- \cup \cup$
$- \mid \cup \cup - - \mid - \cup \cup - \mid \cup \cup - -$? But Schroeder looms
so large on the metrical field that MARX wisely declines to go
into further detail, and simply remarks that no certain ionicus has
been established and that the longs are never resolved, so that in the
epitrites we have to do with dactyls and not ionici. That these
dactyls occur now with anakrusis, now without, is too familiar a
fact to excite astonishment. The same κῶλα appear with and
without anakrusis. The anakrusis is a mere accident.

One of these anakrustic series, however, has proved fateful,
the Enoplios, which has started an enopliac mania. This Enop-
lios Herkenrath has followed through all Greek literature,
'thorough bush, thorough brier'. Said Enoplios is found in
Archilochos, 'Ερασμονίδη Χαρίλαε preceding an ithyphallicus of
ominous content χρῆμά τοι γελοῖον. This is imitated by Kratinos
in his Archilochoi, 'Ερασμονίδη Βάθιππε τῶν ἀωρολείων, and Herken-
rath makes two forms of ἐνόπλιοι; a Χαρίλαε Enoplios and a Βάθιππε
Enoplios. ' All this is very uncertain', says MARX. Proper names
play the dickens with metres <as well as with etymology.>

But let us go back to the question : Have we a right to assume
that the different γένη were reduced to a uniformity of time?
Have we a right to assume an equality of bars? MARX answers
that question with an emphatic No. There is no woe upon us to
prolong the first syllable of the epitrite $\llcorner \cup - -$, as is done in
my Pindar. Why not regard the final long as a sign of the close,

as a pause.   In πυρφόρος ὃς τότε μαινομένᾳ ξὺν ὁρμᾷ — ◡ ◡ — ◡ ◡ — ◡ ◡ — ◡ — — πυρφόρος is a good honest dactyl, not a so-called cyclical dactyl.   True, we have shortened dactyls in the iambic-trochaic verses of tragedy, but there we find an external sign.   The two shorts must be connected with the following long <for MARX makes no allowance for the difference between song and recitation>.   Indeed, he scouts Boeckh's argument for the unity of the bar, based on the impossibility of singing or dancing such choral verses with two kinds of measure.   We know nothing about the way in which the choruses were delivered and MARX thinks that there is no evidence that dactyls were ever danced and expresses his conviction that the iambico-trochaic measures, the tripudiant measures, so to speak, were the only jigging ones.

The rest of the paper is taken up with the subject of Latin metres, which lies beyond my competence even more hopelessly than that of Greek metres.

The high hopes, with which I began the reading of MARX's lecture, were dashed by the close.   It is a pity for me that the two parts hang together.   In 1850 Theodor Kock published a programme on the Parodos in Tragedy.   The paper attracted some attention, and when I was a student in Bonn, 1852–3, I heard Kock's Parodos discussed by two authorities on the same day, in the morning by Leopold Schmidt, in the afternoon by Friedrich Ritschl.   Each of the critics rejected one half, but it was not the same half.   If I could only have 'dimidiatus Marcius.' As it is, I can only renew the plaint of eight years syne, when I found the 'choriambus cantering over my head once more, and heard the triple watch-dog growl of the molossus and saw the banished antispast come back, the two long arms waving triumphant flippers at either end'.

The demonstrative pronouns need all the attention they have recently received (A. J. P. XXVII 327), and it is to be hoped that impressionistic formulae will be corrected or confirmed by exhaustive statistical research, for which indexes will not always avail.   Indexes are so apt to leave out the very thing one wants to know (A. J. P. XXVI 237).   Accepted doctrines are not always worthy of all acceptation.   So the accepted doctrine of the increasing use of prepositions is subject to serious modifications (A. J. P. XXV 106).   Syntax seems to be a constant interchange of growth and blight.   The impressionist puts forth rules,

which the statistician withers with his North wind's breath. When I said in my Problems in Greek Syntax (A. J. P. XXIII 124), ' It is only in dramatic style that ὅδε can make head against οὗτος, and it is the large use of ὅδε that gives so much of the conversational tone to the discourse of Herodotos', I was not dealing wholly in impressionistic syntax, for I had run trial trenches here and there, but I have long desiderated exact figures. True, the predominance of οὗτος in prose is so patent from indexes that it is not worth discussing except for those who must have exact proportions; and on the other hand in tragedy ὅδε clearly turns the tables on οὗτος, as any rough count will show. For instance, οὗτος in the Antigone yields only 42 per cent. as against 58 for ὅδε; in the Prometheus οὗτος is to ὅδε as 29 : 71. In the Orestes οὗτος : ὅδε :: 23 : 77, and in the I. T. there are four times as many ὅδε's as οὗτος's (A. J. P. XXVII 327), so that a mechanical soul might be tempted to suspect the iambic metre, in which ὅδε has manifestly a great advantage over οὗτος. ὅδε yields a great array of trochaic forms and convenient monosyllables against the beggarly account of οὗτος, τοῦτον, τοῦτ(ο), ταῦτ(α). Add the gesture of the stage, the shift of οὗτος and ὅδε, say, from the right hand to the left, and the thing becomes perfectly simple, if it were not for Aristophanes. But a glance at the old Caravella index of Aristophanes will effectually dispel any illusion as to the predominance of ὅδε in iambic metre because of the iambic metre. Iambic metre may delight in words with a short penult, but there are other considerations besides *metri causa*; and crimes are committed in the name of metrical slavery as well as in the name of civil liberty. Why, I read but the other day that λόγος is excluded from Homer simply because of the pyrrhic form which does not lend itself to the verse as does μῦθος. What metrical disability clings to λέγουσι 'they say'? Μῦθος and λόγος do not cover each other any more than θυμός and νόος, and the trochaic μῦθος could no more have expelled the pyrrhic λόγος than the trochaic θυμός has expelled the pyrrhic νόος. But not to dwell on such φλυαρίαι, to use a mild expression, the contrast in numbers between ὅδε and οὗτος in tragedy and comedy is sensible enough, but it would be dangerous to generalize as to the contrast in usage. True, we should expect greater exactness in comedy, as comedy comes nearer to real life, but even in conventional ranges of prose the shifts between ὅδε and οὗτος give trouble. They have f. i. given trouble to the latest commentator on Isaios. See Wyse on Isai. 4, 3, 3. οὗτος is prevalently 'the party of the other part', but ὅδε may be ' our friend, the enemy', ' our dearest foe', and so = οὗτος. At all events I must say to myself μεταποίησον, and for ' dramatic' read 'tragic'. As for ὅδε in Herodotos, I have not been at the pains to count; but one of my former students, Dr. LEUTNER, a trained observer, has taken the trouble to tabulate the occurrences of the three demonstrative pronouns in Herodotos and Thukydides, and from his figures (reproduced in

Section VIII below) it appears that there is a vast excess of ὅδε's in Herodotos as compared with Thukydides. And this excess becomes more striking if we consider the necessary limitations of ὅδε in historical composition. In historical composition the range of ὅδε is restricted to the speeches and to the personal statements of the author, such as the introductions of the different speakers, such as the Thukydidean ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε, ὅδε ὁ πόλεμος of which so much has been made (A. J. P. I 241). According to a strict account, we should have to consider the frequency of the speeches, which is much greater in Herodotos, and the bulk of the speeches, which is much greater in Thukydides, and it might be well to ask how far one advantage offsets the other. But the main point that comes out from Dr. LEUTNER's statistics is after all not merely the large percentage of ὅδε in Herodotos, but the overwhelming excess of the demonstrative element as a class. This is clearly due to the λέξις εἰρομένη in which Herodotos indulges so freely. In the λέξις εἰρομένη the demonstrative pronouns lend verbal gesture to the story-telling of the prose rhapsodist and heighten the dramatic effect. But here I give way to Professor MILLER, who suggested the research of Dr. LEUTNER, and who has himself worked out a series of tables that cannot fail to interest the student of statistical syntax.

	I					II Speeches					III Eliminating Speeches					IV Elim. also demons. introducing and resum. speeches				
	Th. i 87		Hdt. i 112.5		Ratio of Hdt. to Thuc.	Th. i 28.5		Hdt. i 19		Ratio of Hdt. to Thuc.	Th. i 58.5		Hdt. i 93.5		Ratio of Hdt. to Thuc.	Th. i 58.5		Hdt. i 93.5		Ratio of Hdt. to Thuc.
Pp.	Number	%	Number	%		Number	%	Number	%		Number	%	Number	%		Number	%	Number	%	
οὗτος	235	60	834	77	2.74	67	49	127	65	2.80	168	67	707	80	2.63	155	69	658	84	2.66
Per p.	2.70		7.41			2.35		6.68			2.87		7.56			2.65		7.04		
ὅδε	86	22	190	18	1.71	43	31	46	23	1.60	43	17	144	16	2.08	29	13	90	12	1.92
Per p.	.99		1.69			1.51		2.42			.74		1.54			.50		.96		
ἐκεῖνος	68	18	55	05	.63	28	20	23	12	1.23	40	16	32	04	.50	40	18	32	04	.50
Per p.	.78		.49			.98		1.21			.68		.34			.68		.34		
Total	389	100	1079	100	2.15	138	100	196	100	2.18	251	100	883	100	2.20	224	100	780	100	2.18
Per p.	4.47		9.59			4.84		10.32			4.29		9.44			3.83		8.34		

All demonstrative expressions of the types οὗτος, ὅδε, ἐκεῖνος

<div align="center">V   VI   VII   VIII</div>

Only the Declensional Forms of οὗτος, ὅδε, ἐκεῖνος

Pp.	Th. i 87		Hdt. i 112.5		Ratio of Hdt. to Thuc.	Th. viii 75		Th. i-vii 526		Hdt. i-ix 726		Ratio of Hdt. to Thuc.	Th. i-viii 601		Hdt. i-ix 726		Ratio of Hdt. to Thuc.
	Number	%	Number	%		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%		Number	%	Number	%	
οὗτος	173	58	687	78		182	81	1036	66	4577	82		1218	68	4577	82	
Per p.	1.99		5.93		2.98	2.43		1.97		6.30		3.20	2.03		6.30		3.10
ὅδε	62	21	134	16		10	04	262	17	708	13		272	15	708	13	
Per p.	.71		1.19		1.68	.13		.50		.98		1.96	.45		.98		2.18
ἐκεῖνος	61	21	50	06		33	15	267	17	285	05		300	17	285	05	
Per p.	.70		.44		.63	.44		.51		.39		.76	.50		.39		.78
Total	296	100	851	100		225	100	1565	100	5570	100		1790	100	5570	100	
Per p.	3.40		7.56		2.22	3.00		2.98		7.67		2.57	2.98		7.67		2.57

C. W. E. M.: As Dr. LEUTNER had counted only the declensional forms of οὗτος, ὅδε and ἐκεῖνος and for Thukydides had depended on von Essen's Index, it seemed worth while to make an independent investigation of at least one book each of Thukydides and Herodotos. The books chosen—the first book of each author—are both long books and both contain speeches. In introducing speeches Thukydides usually employs τοιάδε, Herodotos almost invariably τάδε, and this fact led to the inclusion of all the coördinate demonstrative pronouns. Dr. LEUTNER counts adverbial ταύτῃ. Why not οὕτως? Why not ὧδε? Why not ἐκείνως? But these carry with them all the other cognate expressions, including ἐνταῦθα, ἐνθάδε, ἐκεῖ, ἐντεῦθεν, ἐνθένδε, ἐκεῖθεν. The task might have been lightened by depending upon von Essen, but indexes are full of pitfalls, and von Essen's, though an excellent index, exhibits some droll peculiarities. Twenty-eight instances of κἀκεῖνος, etc., and τἀκεῖ, etc., are recorded under κ and τ respectively, and similar curious arrangements are noted elsewhere. To satisfy in part the conditions of the research as stated by Professor GILDERSLEEVE, a separate investigation of the speeches was made and the results recorded in Section II. The speeches and letters of Herodotos being of varying length, some of them consisting of only a few lines, it was necessary to count the lines and reduce them to the old Teubner page of 32 lines and to count solid pages instead of making use of the printed number.

It will be observed that Section II shows a very decided shift in the relations of the demonstrative expressions in the speeches, and this disturbing factor is eliminated in Section III.   But the number of speeches must also be considered. As the speeches are much more numerous in Herodotos than in Thukydides, 96 : 16 for the first book, and as they are frequently introduced by a demonstrative of the ὅδε order followed by a resumptive ταῦτα or the like, Herodotos has a decided advantage over Thukydides ; so that it becomes necessary to eliminate these introductory and resumptive demonstratives. Of the 16 speeches of Thukydides 14 are introduced by the ὅδε class, 13 followed by the οὗτος class, whilst of the 96 speeches of Herodotos 51 are introduced by the ὅδε class, 52 are followed by either οὗτος (49) or ὅδε (3), 45 having no introductory and 44 no resumptive demonstrative. These results are presented in Section IV. A separate count of the declensional forms of οὗτος, ὅδε and ἐκεῖνος without their cognates and coördinates only emphasizes the fact that, in comparison with Thukydides, οὗτος runs far ahead of ὅδε in Herodotos, as may be seen by comparing Section I with Section V.

H. L. W.: Every student of the dawn which immediately precedes the full daylight of history has been perplexed now by the real or apparent lack of harmony in his sources, now by the difficulty of distinguishing legend from fact, and again by the entire absence of testimony of any kind on a given point.   In no field is this more truly the case than in Italy, where tradition and archaeological remains bear witness to a variety of ethnic divisions, whose origin, character, influence, and domain are known to us, with few exceptions, only in the most shadowy outline. On this period of pre-Roman Italy new light has been shed by Professor ETTORE PAIS in a series of geographical, topographical, and historical studies, which have been published before either as monographs or as contributions to various Italian journals, but are now brought together for the first time, furnished with illustrations, and translated into English by C. DENSMORE CURTIS (*Ancient Italy*, by ETTORE PAIS : University of Chicago Press, 1908.   441 pp., $5.24 postpaid).   The limits of space forbid me to enter into the details of the twenty-six chapters which compose the book : perhaps the most interesting are the first on Ausonia and the Ausonians, and the twenty-first and twenty-second, which occupy more than one quarter of the volume and deal with the Siceliot, Italiot, Samnite, and Campanian elements in the earliest history of Rome.   The author subjects the ancient authorities to careful and minute criticism, supplements literary testimony with topographical and archaeological evidence, and makes an especially effective use of the study of local names.

The work of the translator is in the main satisfactory, but his principle of adhering as closely as possible to the Italian form of presentation has occasionally resulted in the production of English which is neither idiomatic nor easy to read. A good map, too, and some indication of the original place of publication of each chapter would have enhanced the usefulness of the book. To criticize these faults, however, is " velut si egregio inspersos reprendas corpore naevos "; for the book, which is admirably printed and well bound in cloth, is worthy of a place in the library of every classical scholar.

———

ANNOUNCEMENT.—An edition of the *Historia Trojana* by Guido delle Colonne is in course of preparation by Dr. NATHANIEL E. GRIFFIN, of Princeton University, whose dissertation on *Dares and Dictys* was noticed in this Journal (XXVIII 437).

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Büechner, 11 E. 17th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Babylonian and Assyrian literature; with introd. by Epiphanius Wilson. Also Armenian literature; tr. into English for the first time; il. with col. pls. and photogravures. New York, *Lamb Publishing Co.*, 1908. 8°, cl., $1.75; hf. mor., $3.50.

Babylonian Talmud; complete in 10 v.; tr. from the original text into English by Dr. Michael L. Rodkinson. Boston, *New Talmud Publishing Co.*, 1908. cl., $50; hf. mor., $75; mor., $100.

Bennett (C. Edwin). A Latin grammar. Rev. ed. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1908. 10+280 pp. 12°, cl., 80 cts.

Bullinger (E. W.) A critical lexicon and concordance to the English and Greek New Testament. 5th ed., rev. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1908. 16+32+17–999 pp. 4°, cl., $5.25.

Cicero. Orations; tr. by C. Duke Yonge; with introd. by C. Hermann Ohly. New York, *Lamb Publishing Co.*, 1908. 10+446 pp. il., 8°, cl., $1.75; hf. mor., $3.50.

Demosthenes. Orations; with introd. by the translator T. Leland, and special introd. by Epiphanius Wilson. New York, *Lamb Publishing Co.*, 1908. 6+448 pp. il. 8°, cl., $1.75; hf. mor., $3.50.

Erasmus (Desiderius). Altera colloquia Latina adapted from Erasmus; with notes and vocabulary by G. M. Edwards. New York, *Putnam*, 1908. 24+136+8 pp. por. 16°, cl., 40 cts. net.

Herodotus. Seventh, eighth and ninth books; tr., with introd., text, apparatus, commentary, appendices, maps by Reginald Walter Macan. In 2 v. v. 1 in 2 pts. New York, *Macmillan*, 1908. 100+356; 357–831; 10+462 pp. 8°, cl., $9 net.

Jebb (R. Claverhouse). Attic orators from Antiphon to Isaeus. 2 v. New York, *Macmillan*, 1876 [1908]. 8°, cl., price reduced from $9 to $5 net; now $5.50 net.

Lane (M. C.) Index to the fragments of the Greek elegiac and iambic poets. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1908. 3+128 pp. 8°, bds., 80 cts.

Plato. Dialogues; with introd. by translator, B. Jowett, and special introd. by M. F. Egan. Aristotle, Politics of Aristotle; tr. by B. Jowett; with introd. by M. F. Egan. New York, *Lamb Publishing Co.*, 1908. 10+208 pp. il. 8°, cl., $1.75; hf. mor., $3.50.

Plato. The republic of Plato; tr. by B. Jowett; with introd. by W. C. Lawton; il. with photogravures. New York, *Lamb Publishing Co.*, 1908. 94+330 pp. 8°, cl., $1.75; hf. mor., $3.50.

Seneca. Selected essays of Seneca; with introd. and notes by A. P. Ball. New York, *Macmillan*, 1908. 34+212 pp. 16°, cl., 60 cts. net.

Terence. The comedies of T.; ed., with introd. and notes, by S. G. Ashmore. New York, *Oxford University Press* (Amer. Branch), 1908. 10+68 +340 pp. 12°, cl., $1.50 net.

Theocritus and Virgil. The idylls of Theocritus and the eclogues of Virgil; tr. into English verse by C. S. Calverley; with an introd. by R. Y. Tyrrell. New York, *Macmillan*, 1908. 38+230 pp. 12°, cl., 80 cts. net; leath., $1.25 net.

Virgil's Æneid, books I–VI; with introd., notes and vocabulary by H. R. Fairclough and Seldon L. Brown. Boston, *Benjamin H. Sanborn & Co.*, 1908. c. 61+515+140 pp. il. pls. 12°, cl., $1.40.

ENGLISH.

Antoninus, M., imperator ad se ipsum. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit I. H. Leopold. XII, 139 pp. 8°. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1908. 2s. 6d.

Homeri opera, recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Thomas W. Allen. 8°. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*. III. Odysseae libros I–XII continens. XII, 229 pp. 1908. IV. Odysseae libros XIII–XXIV continens. 224 pp. 1908. Each vol. 2s. 6d.

Sankaranarayana (P.) An English-Tamil Dictionary, with copious English Synonyms and brief and accurate Definitions. London, 1908. 8°. 1131 pp. 6s. net.

GERMAN.

Aeschinis orationes. Post Fr. Frankium curavit Frider. Blass. Ed. altera correctior. (xiv, 329 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1908. m. 2.80; geb. m. 3.50.

Bibliothek, assyriologische, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. 8°. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* X. Bd. Weissbach (F. H.) u. Bang (W.) Die altpersischen Keilinschriften, in Umschrift u. Uebersetzg. hrsg. 2. (Schluss-) Lfg. 16 S. 1908. m. 2.

Boesch (Paul). Θεωρός. Untersuchung zur Epangelie griechischer Feste. (x, 142 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*, 1908. m. 3.60.

Ciceronis, M. Tullii, de virtutibus libri fragmenta, collegit Herm. Knoellinger. (Supplementum Ciceronianum.) (vi, 96 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1908. m. 2.40.

Cichorius (Conr.) Untersuchungen zu Lucilius. (ix, 364 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1908. m. 12.

Commentationes Aenipontanae quas edunt E. Kalinka et A. Zingerle. 8°. Innsbruck, *Wagner*. II. Lackner (R.) De casuum, temporum, modo-

rum usu in Ephemeride Dictyis-Septimii. (iv, 55 S.) 1908. m. 1. III.
Pfeifauf (A.) Der Artikel vor Personen- u. Götternamen bei Thukydides u.
Herodot. (iv, 68 S.) 1908. m. 1.20.

Dissertationes philologicae Argentoratenses selectae. Edd. B. Keil et
R. Reitzenstein. Vol. XIII. 8°. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner.* Fasc. 1.
Coulon (Vict.) Quaestiones criticae in Aristophanis fabulas. (277 S.)
1907. m. 9.

Euripidis fabulae. Ediderunt R. Prinz et N. Wecklein. Vol. I. Pars VII.
Cyclops. Iterum ed. N. Wecklein. (iii, 40 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner,*
1908. m. 1.40.

Firmici Materni, Iulli, de errore profanarum religionum. Ed. Konr.
Ziegler. (xlviii, 120 S. mit 2 phototyp. Taf.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner,*
1907. m. 3.60.

Gemoll (Wilh.) Griechisch-deutsches Schul- u. Handwörterbuch. (vi,
821 S.) 8°. Wien, *F. Tempsky*; Leipzig, *G. Freytag,* 1908. geb. m. 8.

Geyer (R.) Altarabische Diiamben. (viii, 113 u. 211 S.) 8°. Leipzig,
R. Haupt, 1908. m. 18.

Heinze (Rich.) Virgils epische Technik. 2. Aufl. (x, 498 S.) 8°.
Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner,* 1908. geb. m. 14.

Hesiodi carmina. Recensuit Alois. Rzach. Ed. altera. Accedit certamen
quod dicitur Homeri et Hesiodi. (v, 264 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner,*
1908. geb. m. 2.30.

Inscriptiones graecae. Consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum
regiae borussicae editae. 40 × 28,5 cm. Berlin, *G. Reimer.* Vol. IX.
Pars II. Inscriptiones Graeciae septentrionalis voluminibus VII et VIII
non comprehensae. Pars II. Inscriptiones Thessaliae. Consilio et auctori-
tate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae ed. Otto Kern. Indices com-
posuit F. Hiller de Gaertringen. Inest tabula geographica una. (xxxii,
338 S. mit Abbildgn.) 1908. m. 49.

Jahn (Wilh.) Das Saurapuranam. Einleitung, Inhaltsangabe nebst
Uebersetzgn., Erklärgn. u. Indices. (xxvii, 208 S. mit 1 Stammtaf.) 8°.
Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner,* 1908. m. 5.50.

Iurisprudentiae anteiustinianae reliquias in usum maxime academicum
compositas a Ph. Eduardo Huschke ed. VI aucta et emendata ediderunt
E. Seckel et B. Kuebler. Vol. I. (xxxi, 504 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner,*
1908. geb. m. 5.

Lederer (Siegfr.) Index in T. Macci Plauti militem gloriosum. (58 S.)
8°. Prag, *Taussig & Taussig,* 1908. m. 2.

Lycophronis Alexandra. Recensuit Eduard. Scheer. Vol. II, scholia
continens. (lxiv, 398 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann,* 1908. m. 18.

Menander. Szenen aus Menanders Komödien. Deutsch v. Carl Robert.
(131 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann,* 1908. m. 2.40.

Menandri quatuor fabularum Herois, Disceptantium, Circumtonsae,
Samiae fragmenta nuper reperta post Gustav. Lefeburium cum prolego-

menis et commentariis iterum ed. J. van Leeuwen. (viii, 179 S.) 8°. Leiden, *A. W. Sijthoff*, 1908. m. 5.50.

Neckel (Gust.) Beiträge zur Eddaforschung. Mit Exkursen zur Heldensage. (viii, 512 S.) 8°. Dortmund, *F. W. Ruhfus*, 1908. m. 16.

Pierrugues (P.) Glossarium eroticum linguae latinae. Ed. altera. (Anastatischer Druck.) (viii, 518 S.) 8°. Berlin, *H. Barsdorf*, 1908. geb. m. 25.

Plini Caecili Secundi, C., epistularum libri novem, epistularum ad Traianum liber, panegyricus. Recensuit R. C. Kukula. (xii, 415 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1908. geb. m. 3.60.

Poematis latini rell. ex vol. Herculanensi evulgatas, denuo recognovit, nova fragmenta ed. Ioa. Ferrara. (52 S. mit 13 Taf.) 8°. Papiae, 1908. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*. m. 4.

Sophokles' Antigone. Metrische Uebersetzg. v. Herm. v. Schelling. 2., neu durchgeseh. Aufl. (102 S.) 8°. Berlin, *K. Curtius*, 1908. m. 3.

Täuber (C.) Ortsnamen u. Sprachwissenschaft. Ursprache u. Begriffsentwicklg. (259 S. mit Titelbild.) 8°. Zürich, *Art. Institut Orell Füssli*, 1908. m. 5.

Zielinski (Th.) Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte. 2. verm. Aufl. (viii, 453 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1908. geb. m. 8.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Allen (Ed. A.)   English Doublets.   Reprinted from Publications of the Modern Language Association XXIII No. 2.

Anger (Louis).   Le Poème d'Orientius.   Ed. critique, étude philologique et littéraire, traduction.   Paris, *A. Fontemoing*, 1903.

Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur.   XXXIV. Band.   1. Heft.   Halle a. S., *Max Niemeyer*, 1908.

Butler (Orma Fitch).   Studies in the Life of Heliogabalus.   New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1908.

Calderini (Aristide).   La manomissione e la condizione dei liberti in Grecia.   Milano, *Ulrico Hoepli*, 1908.   L. 12.

Carroll (Mitchell).   The Attica of Pausanias.   With Introduction, Notes, Plans, and Excursuses.   Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1908.   Mailing price, $1.75.

Certamen Poeticum Hoeufftianum.   Ad Conventum Hagensem de publica Pace.   Accedunt quattuor poemata laudata.   Amstelodami, *apud Io. Mullerum*, MCMVIII.

Ciceronis (M. T. C.)   Paradoxa Stoicorum.   Academicorum Reliquiae cum Lucullo.   Timaeus. De Natura Deorum. De Divinatione. De Fato.   Ed. Otto Plasberg.   Fasciculus I.   Lipsiae, *In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri*, MCMVIII. 8 m.

Ciceros Brutus.   Erkl. v. O. Jahn.   5. Aufl.   Bearbeitet v. W. Kroll (Haupt u. Sauppesche Sammlung).   Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1908.   3 m.

Corpus Medicorum Graecorum auspiciis Academiarum associatarum edd. Academiae Berolinensis, Hauniensis, Lipsiensis X 1, 1.   Philumeni De Venenatiss Animalibus ex Codice Vaticano primum ed. Maximilianus Wellmann.   Lipsiae et Berolini, *In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri*, MCMVIII.   2 m. 80.

Dickey (William P.)   On delays before ἀναγνωρίσεις in Greek Tragedy. Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.   Vol. XLIII, No. 17, May, 1908.

Dihigo (Dr. Juan M.)   Las Raices Griegas.   (Publicado en la "Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias".)   Habana, *Imprenta Avisador Comercial*, 1908.

Ekkehards Waltharius.   Ein Kommentar von J. W. Beck.   Groningen, *P. Noordhoff*, 1908.

Ellis (Robinson).   The Annalist Licinianus.   London and Oxford, *Henry Frowde*, 1908.   1s.

26

Euripide. Les Bacchantes. Texte grec. Édition avec commentaire critique et explicatif et precédé d'une introduction. Par Georges Dalmeyda. Paris, *Hachette et C⁰ᵉ·* 1908.

Farinelli (Arturo). Dante e la Francia dall' età media al secolo di Voltaire. 2 vols. Milano, *Ulrico Hoepli,* 1908.

Fitz-Hugh (Thomas). Prolegomena to the History of Italo-Romaic Rhythm. Charlottesville, Va., *Anderson Brothers,* 1908.

Gregory (Caspar René). Das Freer-Logion. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs.* New York, *Lemcke & Buechner,* 11 E. 17th Street, 1908. 2 m.

Handbuch der klass. Altertumswissenschaft. 7. Bd. 1. Teil. Wilhelm von Christs Geschichte der griechischen Literatur. 5. Aufl. Unter Mitwirkung von Otto Stählin bearbeitet von Wilhelm Schmid. Erster Teil: Klassische Periode der griechischen Literatur. München, *C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung,* 1908. 13 m. 50 pf.

Harder (Franz). Schülerkommentar zu der Auswahl aus Herodot. Zweite, verb. Aufl. Leipzig, *G. Freytag.* Wien, *F. Tempsky,* 1908. 1 m. 20 pf.

Hermes. 43. Bd. 3. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung,* 1908.

Housman (A. E.) The Apparatus Criticus of the Culex. (Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society. Vol. VI. Part 1.) Cambridge, *University Press,* 1908. 1s. 6d.

Jahn (Wilhelm). Das Saurapurāṇam. Ein Kompendium spätindischer Kulturgeschichte u. des 'Sivaismus. Straszburg, *K. J. Trübner,* 1908.

Kingsford (A.) Ἐπέκεινα τῶν δυσμῶν τοῦ ἡλίου. Μετάφρασις I. Βασιλείου. ἐν Ὀξφόρδῃ. Ἔρευνα 1908.

Krause (Ernst). Diogenes von Apollonia. Erster Teil. Beilage zu dem Jahresberichte des kön. Gymnasiums zu Gnesen-Osten, 1908. Posen, *Merzbachsche Buchdruckerei.*

Lehmann (C. F.) Babyloniens Kulturmission einst u. jetzt. 2. unveränderte Aufl. Leipzig, *Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung,* 1905. 2 m. 40 pf.

Lucilius, Untersuchungen zu. Von Conrad Cichorius. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung,* 1908. 12 m.

Lycophronis Alexandra. Recensuit Eduardus Scheer. Vol. II. Scholia continens. Berolini, *apud Weidmannos,* MDCCCCVIII. 18 m.

Manilius (M.) Astronomica. Herausg. v. Theodor Breiter. II Kommentar. Leipzig, *Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung,* MDCCCCVIII. 4 m. 20 pf.

Μελέτη ('Η.) Μηνιαῖον δημοσίευμα. 'Απρίλιος, Μαῖος, 'Ιούνιος-'Ιούλιος, 1908. @ 1 δρ.

Menander, Der neue. Von Carl Robert. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung,* 1908. 4 m. 50 pf.

Menanders Komödien, Szenen aus. Deutsch v. Carl Robert. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung,* 1908.

Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher. Band XV. Heidelberg, *Verlag von G. Koester,* 1908.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. B. Gerth. Elfter Jahrg., 1908. XXI. u. XXII. Bandes 4. 5. 6. u. 7. Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1908.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Nr. 3/4, 1908. Helsingfors, 1908.

Owen (E. T.) Hybrid parts of speech. Vol. XVI. Part II. Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters. May, 1908.

Pascal (Carlo). La composizione del libro terzo dell' Eneide. Nota letta alla R. Academia di Archeologia. Napoli, 1908.

Pirrone (Nicola). Fraseologia Ciceroniana ad uso delle scuole classiche. Milano, Palermo, Napoli, *Remo Sandron*, 1908. 2 l. 50.

Platonův Ion. Napsal Rudolf Neuhöfer. V Brně, 1908.

Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expedition to Syria in 1904–5. Division III. Greek and Latin Inscriptions in Syria by Enno Littmann and William Kelly Prentice. Section A, Part 1. Section B, Part 1. Leyden, *Late E. J. Brill*, 1908.

Regnaud (Paul). Dictionnaire Étymologique du latin et du grec. Lyon, *A. Rey*; Paris, *E. Leroux*, 1908.

Report of the Maryland State Horticultural Society. Tenth Annual Meeting. Vol. X for the year 1907. Published by the Society in April, 1908. Ed. by C. P. Close, Sec. College Park, Md.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. N. F. 63. Bandes 3. Heft. Frankfurt a. M., *J. D. Sauerländer's Verlag*, 1908.

Schleif (Oscar). The Technic of English. Philadelphia, 1748 Tenth St. *The Author*. 75 c.

Showerman (Grant). On the Teaching of Cicero. Vol. III. No. 7. May, 1908.

Sophocles, The Trachiniae of. With a commentary abridged from the larger edition of Sir R. C. Jebb by G. A. Davies. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1908. $1.

Studies in Philology (University of North Carolina). Vol. III. The Influence of E. T. A. Hoffmann on the Tales of Edgar Allan Poe, by Palmer Cobb. Chapel Hill, *The University Press*, 1908.

Σύλλογος πρὸς διάδοσιν ὠφελίμων βιβλίων. 'Αρ. 93. Τὸ 'Εμπόριον. ἐν 'Αθήναις. 40 λ.

Terenti (P. T. Afri.) Comoediae. The Comedies of Terence ed. with Introd. and Notes by Sidney G. Ashmore. *Oxford University Press* (American Branch), New York, 1908.

Types of English Literature. Ed. by W. A. Neilson. Tragedy. By Ashley H. Thorndike. Boston, *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*, 1908. $1.50.

Ungnad (Arthur). Selected Business Documents of the Neo-Babylonian Period. Leyden, *Late E. J. Brill*, 1908.

Universidad de la Habana. Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Vol. VI. Num. 3. Mayo de 1908. *Imprenta " Avisador Comercial."*

Vahleni (Ioannis) Opuscula Academica. Pars Posterior. Prooemia Indicibus Lectionum Praemissa. XXXIV–LXIII ab A. MDCCCLXXXVII ad A. MDCCCCVI. Lipsiae, *In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri*, MDCCCCVIII. 14 m.

Varese(Prospero). Cronologia Romana. Vol. I. Il Calendario Flaviano. Parte prima. Libri I–II. Roma, *E. Loescher e Co.*, 1908.

Vettii Valentii Anthologiarum Libri. Primum ed. Guilelmus Kroll. Berolini, *Ap. Weidmannos*, MDCCCCVIII. 16 m.

Virgil's Aeneid. Books I–VI. With Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by H. R. Fairclough and Seldon L. Brown. New York, *Benj. H. Sanborn & Co.*, 1908. $1.40.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulrich von). De Euripidis Stheneboea. Reprinted from Classical Philology, Vol. III, No. 3, July, 1908. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press.*

——— Gedaechtnisrede auf Adolf Kirchhoff. Aus den Abh. der Königl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. vom Jahre 1908. Berlin, *Verlag der Königl. Ak. d. Wiss.*, 1908.

Yoshioka (Gen-Ichiro). A Semantic Study of the Verbs of Doing and Making in the Indo-European Languages (Chicago Diss.). Tokyo, 1908.